THE PROBLEM OF SANSKRIT TEACHING

संस्कृतानुशीलनविवेकः ।

BY

Ganesh Shripad (Balashastri) Huparikar,
M. A., B. T.,

Professor of Sanskrit,
Rajaram College, Kolhapur.

1949

Price Rs. 12/8/-

By the same Author

Sanskrit

1. An Introduction to the 'धार्मिकविमर्शसमुच्चय' of Shree Shankaracharya of Karveer Peeth
2. कुमारसम्भव सर्ग १, with the Sanskrit commentary of Navaneet Rama—Edited

English

3. Sublimation of Instincts

Marathi Poetry

4. मधुसम्भार (*Published*), 5 अभिसार (*Unpublished*).

Marathi essays on poetry philosophy, aesthetics, etc

6. तत्त्वज्ञकवि–श्रीज्ञानेश्वर (Published in श्रीज्ञानेश्वरदर्शन)
7. भावनिनादभूमिका–An introduction to the भावनिनाद of the poet Sumant 8 काव्य व काव्यवृत्ति, 9 कवीचा अन्त साक्षात्कार, 10 निरीक्षण, 11 सत्य आणि सौंदर्य, 12 काव्यातील सामान्यकथन, 13 सुश्लोकगोविंद–काव्यपरीक्षण, 14 विचारस्वातंत्र्य, 15 सच्चिदानंद, 16 आदिकाव्याचा जन्म, 17 कविवर्य तांबे व अध्यात्मवादी काव्य, 18 आगरकरांचे वैशिष्ट्य (All essays are published in magaz nes).

Published by
The Bharat Book Stall
Kolhapur City (India)

Printed by
K H Sahasrabudhye,
Shree Dnyaneshwar Press,
Kolhapur City

Dedicated

to

The sacred memory of my revered father

THE LATE

PANDIT BALASHĀSTRI HUPARIKAR

of

The Rajaram College, Kolhapur.

By the same Author

Sanskrit

1. An Introduction to the 'धार्मिकविमर्शसमुच्चयः' of *Shree Shankaracharya of Karveer Peeth.*
2. कुमारसम्भव सर्ग १, with the Sanskrit commentary of *Navaneet Rama—Edited.*

English

3. Sublimation of Instincts.

Marathi Poetry

4. मधुसम्भार (Published); 5. अभिसार (Unpublished).

Marathi essays on poetry, philosophy, aesthetics, etc.

6. तत्त्वज्ञकवि—श्रीज्ञानेश्वर (*Published in* श्रीज्ञानेश्वरदर्शन).
7. भावनिनादभूमिका—*An introduction to the* भावनिनाद *of the* poet Sumant; *8* काव्य व काव्यवृत्ति; *9* कवीचा अन्तःसाक्षात्कार; 10. निरीक्षण; 11. सत्य आणि सौंदर्य; 12 काव्यातील सामान्यकथन; 13. सुश्लोकगोविंद—काव्यपरीक्षण; 14. विचारस्वातंत्र्य, 15. सच्चिदानंद; 16. आदिकाव्याचा जन्म; 17. कविवर्य तांबे व अध्यात्मवादी काव्य; 18 आगरकरांचे वैशिष्ट्य. (All essays are published in magazines).

Published by
The Bharat Book-Stall,
Kolhapur City (India)

Printed by
K. H. Sahasrabudhye,
Shree Dnyaneshwar Press,
Kolhapur City.

शुभाशीर्वचनपत्रिका ।

श्रीशङ्करो विजयते ।

मुद्रा

> ॥ श्रीः ॥
> अनेकशक्तिसङ्घट्टप्रकाशलहरीघनः ।
> ध्वान्तध्वंसो विजयते विद्याशङ्करभारती ॥

स्वस्ति...श्रीमच्छङ्कराचार्यान्वयसञ्जाताभिनवपञ्चगङ्गातीरवासकमलानिकेतनकरवीरसिंहासनाधीश्वरश्रीविद्यानृसिंहभारतीकरकमलसञ्जातश्रीमदभिनवविद्याशङ्करभारतीस्वामिकृतानि श्रीमत्सपरिवारच्छात्राणामनुदिनमेधमानभव्यजनकानि श्रीमच्छङ्कराराधनावसरीयनारायणस्मरणानि—

श्रीयुतहुपरीकरोपाह्वपण्डितवरबालशास्त्रितनुजनुषो नैकविद्याविभूषितस्य 'एम्. ए.'-पदवीधारिणः संस्कृतप्राध्यापकगणेशशर्मणो लब्धवर्णस्य भव्याय भूयासुः । विशेषस्तु—

नितान्तसन्तोषस्थानमिदं यदेतद् भवत्प्रणीतम्, अनल्पानवद्यबन्धाध्यारोपितविविधानेकादेशनियमपूर्वकं साम्प्रतिकाङ्ग्लविद्यालयीनाध्येत्रध्यापकानां गीर्वाणवाण्यध्ययनाध्यापनयोः समुचितपथप्रदर्शनैककार्यनिरतम्, अमरभारत्या सद्ग्रथितं, 'संस्कृतानुशीलनविवेकः' इत्यन्वर्थनामधेयं प्रकरणम् अस्मद्दृगध्वनीनं कृतं भवद्भिरिति ।

एतस्मिन्प्रकरणे सम्यङ्निरीक्षितान्यस्माभिर्वाङ्मयाभ्यास—संस्कृताध्ययनदुरवस्था—तद्दूरीकरणोपाय—प्राच्यप्रतीच्यशिक्षणपद्धतिसमीक्षा—पद्धतितारतम्य—शास्त्राध्यापन—पाठ्यक्रम—परिशिष्ट—प्रभृतीनि प्रधानतः प्रकरणानि । तदन्तरे च प्रस्तावना, उपसंहारः, गद्यपद्यभेदः, सदध्यापनपार्श्वभूमिकादीनि प्रकरणानि विद्यन्ते । इत्थम् अष्टप्रकरणात्मकोऽयं ग्रन्थः 'संस्कृतानुशीलनविवेको' नाम ।

अस्मिन् ग्रन्थे एतत्कर्त्रा समीक्ष्यकारिभिरवश्यमुपादेयं प्रमाणाविरोधि साम्प्रतिकप्रवृत्त्यनतिक्रमणीयं च, स्वीयं वैदुष्यं प्रकटीकृतम्।

प्रचलितायां चास्यां भगवत्प्रेरणया साम्प्रतिकविद्यालयेषु शिक्षणपद्धत्यां छात्राणामतीवोपकारः सिध्येदिति विभाव्यते। यतः,

गैर्वाण्यध्ययनं सुदुर्लभमभूल्लोके यथापद्धति
येऽभ्यस्यन्ति पठन्ति ते खलु वृथा जाने परीक्षाकृते।
सर्वो विस्मृतिमार्गमेत्यहह सोऽभ्यासः परीक्षोत्तरम्
केचित्तूदरपूर्तिरेव हि फलं मत्वा तथाऽधीयते ॥

इतिवदेव सुरभारत्यध्यापनाध्ययने साम्प्रतं सर्वत्र परिदृश्येते।

सर्वथाऽऽलोच्यमानेऽस्मिन् अष्टप्रकरणात्मके निबन्धे नूनं मानसावासिराजहंसवाहनपुरन्ध्रीप्रसादाल्लब्धपितृपितामहादिपरम्पराप्राप्ताऽद्वैतब्रह्मविद्यावैभवोऽप्ययं प्रकृतग्रन्थनिर्माता अन्तेवासिसार्योपकृतिवशंवदः सन् समधीताङ्ग्लविद्यापाटवतः प्राप्त–' एम्. ए.–बी. टी. '–पदवीकोऽत्रत्य-राजारामकॉलेजीयः संस्कृतप्राध्यापकः ' इदं ब्राह्ममिदं क्षात्रम् ' इति रीत्या सव्यसाचीव प्रतिभाति। किञ्चास्मत्सविधे समधीतन्यायसिद्धान्तमुक्तावली–मीमांसान्यायप्रकाश–प्रभृतितर्कमीमांसाशास्त्रीयप्रकरणः सच्चरित्रोऽयं मनीषी· त्यतः श्रीचन्द्रमौलीश्वरश्रीशारदाम्बयोः कृपया सम्प्राप्नोतूभयविद्ययोः फलं, व्याप्नोतु च यशसा जनसमाजं, प्रत्याययतु च नैजवैदुष्येणाधुनिकान्, समाप्नोतु सर्वथोत्कर्षं चोत्तरोत्तरं, लभतां च निरामयं दीर्घायुरित्याशास्महे इति शम्॥

महानुशासनं वरीवर्ति।

| इत्यलम् | मुद्रा

of manuscripts, attempted to write essays on different Shastras, particularly the Vedas, and published works on the history of Sanskrit literature It was Sir William Jones (1784) who first realized the importance of Sanskrit as the most powerful instrument for the development of Comparative Philology, and after him European scholars like Colebrooke, Schlegel, Bopp, Humboldt, H H Wilson, Roth, Max Muller, Bohtlingk, Aufrecht, Thibaut and several others made valuable contributions to the various departments of *Sanskrit learning All these scholars tried to apply* the critical, comparative and historical methods of Europe to the Sanskrit literature in general and to the Vedic literature in particular, engaging themselves more in the chronological and philological studies

In spite of these attempts of some Western scholars to show the cultural value of Sanskrit learning, the British Government *thought of gradually changing* from its former policy of patronizing Oriental lore to that of introducing Western knowledge This was quite natural from the viewpoint of the foreign Government which had not properly recognized the cultural value of Sanskrit and had placed in the forefront the utilitarian value of education in the sense of the needs of administration and Government service As a natural result of all this, there arose between the Orientalists and the Anglicists a great controversy regarding the relative merits of the Eastern and Western learning and the educational policy to be adopted in India It was at last set at rest after many *years* by *Lord Macaulay's famous* educational Minute (1835) which undervalued Sanskrit learning and laid down the general policy that the diffusion of Western knowledge through the medium of English should be the chief concern of the Government It may, therefore, be said that Macaulay was the first to lay the foundations of the present system of education and establish the predominance of English in India, though some changes were subsequently

introduced in that system from time to time The educational Despatch of Sir Charles Wood (1854), however, recognized the value of Oriental learning "for historical and antiquarian purposes, for the study of Law and for the critical cultivation and improvement of the vernacular languages" Macaulay himself could witness with joy how English education was thriving with results favourable to the Government As a consequence of this wide diffusion of Western knowledge the universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras were established in 1857, and in their curriculum Sanskrit was given a secondary place in accordance with the policy laid down in Wood's Despatch It was merely on sufferance that the British Government allowed Sanskrit to remain either as the chief subject to be studied in the then existing Sanskrit Colleges or as one among many subjects prescribed in the universities, though it had not fully realized its value The literary activities of the Western scholars above indicated perhaps convinced the Government of the value of Sanskrit as an indispensable aid to historical, critical and philological studies, and though Sanskrit was prescribed as a subject in the Universities, it began to be studied there through the medium of English, particularly from the historical, critical and philological points of view Thus the Western methods of study began to be applied to Sanskrit language and literature and eminent Indian scholars like Dr R G Bhandarkar, MM Ganganath Jha and MM. Hara Prasad Shastri, who had imbibed those Western methods, came forth as the products of Universities

Sanskrit literature thus began to be taught in secondary schools and colleges on Western lines, while the traditional methods of the venerable Shastris, though they had proved efficacious for centuries from the point of view of intensive study, were thrown into the background to the extent of being considered obsolete in English schools and colleges. Sanskrit text books prescribed in the universities continued

to be edited or written particularly with the application of Western methods by several Indian and European scholars for the use of schools and colleges Dr R G Bhandarkar, to whom all lovers of Sanskrit must be greatly indebted for his valuable services to the cause of Sanskrit learning, wrote many *historical, philological, chronological and critical essays* on Sanskrit literature in the light of Western methods, and published critical editions of Sanskrit classics for the use of Oriental scholars and advanced students in colleges Again, the demand for school text-books serving mainly the philological and etymological ends was naturally felt, and in this case also Dr Bhandarkar, adopting from the West the Grammar-translation method of teaching Greek and Latin current at that time, wrote, through the medium of English, his two famous text-books (1864 and 1868) for schools according to the plan laid down by Dr Haug

As time passed, the development of psychology in the West and the attempts of the Western Educationists to *psychologize* Education enormously modified our outlook The principles of language study, which are a natural outcome of researches into child psychology, are now adopted in the West *with great success for* language *teaching* by O Jespersen, H E Palmer and others and even for the teaching of classical languages like Greek and Latin by Dr Rouse in the *Perse School* (*Cambridge*) *The same trend* in education has induced Indian lovers of Sanskrit like Prof V P Bokil to employ those principles in the teaching of a similar classical language like Sanskrit *Obviously the* so-called Direct Method of teaching Sanskrit is an imitation *of the up-to-date methods of teaching classical languages in* the West, just as Dr Bhandarkar's Grammar-translation method was also an imitation of the Classical Method current in Europe eighty-five years ago There is nothing wrong in 'imitation' if it is not blind and if things imitated are good On the other hand, according to the modern psycho-

logical principles of education 'imitation' is a powerful factor in the learning process When all our endeavours to improve education have proceeded up to this time on Western lines, it is but natural that Indian Educationists should try to improve the teaching of Sanskrit mainly along the lines indicated by Western scholars of classical languages Prof Bokil and others have found in the light of psychology and considerable experience that the Conversational or Direct Method of teaching Sanskrit in schools, if adopted with some modifications, will achieve results more satisfactory than those achieved by the Grammar-translation method But in spite of some good features of this method the general adoption of it is not as yet recommended These advocates of the New Method are now dimly beginning to realize the merits of the Shastri Method and acknowledge that a few features of the latter are in consonance with the modern principles of language-study Yet, to rest satisfied merely with what the Western scholars have done for us as regards the methods of study and teaching would be insufficient It is high time now to show in detail the definite points of similarity between the Eastern and Western methods and carry on further researches so as to trace the former as recorded in Sanskrit literature or handed down by oral tradition

The present work is a modest attempt to demonstrate this fact The detailed table of contents and the Conclusion (Section XVIII, Pp 531-544) of my comprehensive essay on 'Hindu Methodology' are calculated to give an adequate idea of the nature and scope of my work I may, therefore, briefly state here that I have adopted throughout the work a comparative view of the Eastern and Western methodology and of the theories of both about language, bringing out at many places their psychological, philosophical, aesthetic and educational implications The speciality, if any, of the present attempt may not lie merely in the reproduction of

the ancient and modern principles, but lies, perhaps, in the exploration of untrodden paths and harmonization of the Eastern and Western thoughts for the purpose of placing the reformed teaching of *Sanskrit* in *schools* and *colleges* on a sounder and permanent basis

This work was undertaken by me in 1937 when I was teaching Methods in Sanskrit to B T students in the S M. T T College, Kolhapur At that time an idea struck me that the modern methods of teaching Sanskrit language and *literature bore the semblance of the* खण्डान्वय *method actually* employed in Sanskrit commentaries I was reminded of an *unpublished Sanskrit commentary* (*on the* कुमारसम्भव) *which* had employed the खण्डान्वय method The use of this manuscript *in our possession was recommended to me at the* elementary stage by my revered father at whose feet I had the proud privilege of learning Sanskrit literature and Shastras To my surprise I found that the Sanskrit questions and answers used in the New Method of teaching Sanskrit literature were just like those in the above-mentioned commentary I then searched for other published or unpublished commentaries (of the खण्डान्वय type) on other Sanskrit Classics and discovered that this method had been much in vogue before मल्लिनाथ, who followed the दण्डान्वय. This खण्डान्वय method, I thought, might not have been so *widely recorded in Sanskrit literature, unless it had been* actually employed in oral teaching in ancient times I then *began to search for the theoretical basis of this method in* the Sanskrit Shastras and literature and came to the conclusion that it had been strongly backed up by the amalgamated theories of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण, and that there had existed in the Hindu Shastras a sound, consistent and universal methodology, which would compare favourably with the Western methodology I was also backed up by the details

of the precious Shastric traditions handed down to me by oral transmission. For my special purpose I ransacked the extensive written material available to me in the printed or manuscript form on the Shastras like the व्याकरण, न्याय, मीमांसा, साहित्य and वेदान्त. It is needless to say here that I availed myself also of notable works in English on psychology, language-learning and other relevant subjects, and that I utilized a considerable time to arrive at the above conclusions. I then published a Sanskrit questionnaire on the Problem of Sanskrit Teaching and sent it to many Sanskrit scholars all over India for the purpose of inviting their opinions about this problem. It however met with a scanty response. I then contributed some Sanskrit essays to Sanskrit periodicals, expressing my settled views on this problem and desiring to know how far my harmonization of the Eastern and Western principles would appeal to the old-typed Shastris. To my great satisfaction I found that they appealed to many notable Shastris and modern scholars. But realizing that the circulation of Sanskrit periodicals was limited and that the English medium would have a wider appeal I set myself to the task of writing in English, and contributed a few articles to English periodicals All those Sanskrit and English essays with an extensive additional matter have been embodied in the present work, the major portion of which, however, has not been published anywhere.

It will thus be noticed that though I began with investigations into the methods of Sanskrit teaching current in Training Colleges, I had to widen the scope of my work in the light of my experience in the Arts College I, therefore, concentrated myself upon the wider problem of Sanskrit studies both in Arts and Training Colleges, and also upon the higher Western methods of investigation, viz, the historical, comparative, philological, and critical or scientific methods that have engaged the attention of Sanskrit scholars

in the East as well as the West I think that those Western methods, though good in some respects have their own *limitations and that the traditional methods of the Shastris,* notwithstanding a few flaws in them, are well worthy of the appreciative notice of modern scholars Being brought up in the Shastric traditions I deplore their decay caused by political circumstances and their undeserved condemnation by some modern scholars I am of humble opinion that a happy combination of the best parts of the Eastern and Western methods in the study and teaching of Sanskrit will ensure better results in future I have thus made my work compre hensive by devoting my attention not only to the methods of teaching Sanskrit at the initial stage, but also to those at the higher stage for, I think that there is organic unity in the study and teaching of Sanskrit at all the stages This is *the reason why in the present work the portion dealing with* the theoretical basis of methods or general methodology *(Parts I & II) is much larger than that dealing with the* practice of teaching (Parts I & III) The treatment of the latter, which embodies my practical experience of many years, is, however, full and quite adequate to the requirements of students under training The present work is therefore calculated to be useful not only to B T students but also to the students of higher classes in Arts Colleges and to all general readers interested in Sanskrit The future will decide how far this humble attempt of mine will be appreciated by the custodians of Sanskrit learning It will not, however be unbecoming to seek their pleasure in the apt words of Kalidasa 'आ परितोषाद्विदुषां न साधु मन्ये प्रयोगविज्ञानम्'. It is now many years since I began this labour of love, and it is purely by the grace of the Almighty that I could perseveringly come to the end of the projected task in spite of the unforeseen calamities in my life during this period I shall feel myself amply rewarded if my labour in

any way proves instrumental to the rejuvenation and popularization of the study of Sanskrit

The Sanskrit Section (Part I) in my work, it is hoped, will appeal to Shastris and modern Sanskrit scholars and the English Section (Parts II & III) to all readers knowing English It may be noted here that the English Section is not the translation of, but is complementary to, the Sanskrit Section, as the same vein of thought runs through the whole work The Sanskrit medium in this work is partly adopted by me with no other motive than that of bringing the Pandits, not knowing English, into line with the modern trends of Sanskrit studies Moreover, the literary history of India indicates that Sanskrit has been recognized up to the present day by scholars as a fit medium for recording their valuable and permanent thoughts It is my humble opinion that in free India, where English is losing ground, Sanskrit, the immortal speech (अमरभारती), will and should resume its former prominent position as a fit medium for conveying important thoughts at least to the learned public all over India, though not as the lingua franca of India Dr F W Thomas says 'I, therefore, do not feel that the idea of Sanskrit (in a further simplified form) resuming its place as a common literary medium for India is a hopelessly lost cause I also wish that in the teaching of Sanskrit at all the stages the medium of instruction should be Sanskrit as well as the mother-tongue I, however, think that the international importance of English should not be minimized.

It is now my pleasant duty to express my heartfelt obligations to all persons concerned with the progress of my work In the first place I heartily express my indebtedness to all the authors and editors whose works and publications I have consulted I owe a deep debt of gratitude to His Holiness the Jagadguru Shree Vidya-Shankar-Bharati Swami of Karweer Peeth who has graciously recorded his blessings for this work and at whose revered feet I had the

Contents

Part I–Sanskrit Section.

prose and poetry-Aim of teaching poetry-Qualifications of the teacher of poetry-'Questions' versus 'lecturing' and emotional teaching versus intellectual teaching-खण्डान्वय method stressed-Approach of Shastris to poetry-Figures of speech-Propriety of metres-Teaching of dramas-Methods of analysis and synthesis-Psychological synthesis is the best approach-Limitations of the historical approach to poetry pp 34-49.

VII पाठादर्शः । The practical procedure to be followed in a lesson on poetry. pp 49-56.

VIII शब्दशक्तिग्रहः । The significance of words-The eight principles of language-study unanimously recognized by the Shastras like व्याकरण (पद), मीमांसा (वाक्य) and न्याय (प्रमाण).-(a) Grammar, (b) Comparison, (c) Dictionary, (d) Statement of a trustworthy person, (e) Usage of elders, (f) Supplementary statement, (g) Explanation or Commentary and (h) Contiguity of words

(a) **Grammar**. Its teaching based by the Shastris on the Nominal structure of Sanskrit language-कारक (case-relation) and compounds more important than the finite verb and etymology-The Nominal order of grammatical topics followed by various grammarians since the time of पाणिनि. (e) **Usage of elders**: The principles underlying the Conversational Method of the West anticipated by the Hindu schools of thought (g) **Explanation or commentary**: Gradual development of the methods of exposition since the Vedic times traced-Those methods are embodied in the oral explanation and written explanation or commentaries-Varieties of commentary literature-Organization of knowledge into commentary literature-Common features (पद, वाक्य, प्रमाण) of methodology in Shastras-Oral tradition of the methods of exposition traced-Commentaries are the written evidence of the oral methods-Oral work stressed in ancient

---

Part II-English Section
Theory

II HINDU METHODOLOGY OF EDUCATION

[*Eighteen sections dealing with a comprehensive survey of the ancient Hindu methodology embedded in the* व्याकरण, मीमांसा, न्याय, वेदान्त and साहित्य.]

etymological method and पाणिनि's *analytical method*-कात्यायन and पतञ्जलि-Scientific exposition of grammar by पतञ्जलि-Categories of the वैशेषिक's, the अन्वयव्यतिरेक method of the न्याय and a few principles of the मीमांसा accepted by पतञ्जलि-जात्यादिवाद-Interpretation or Explanation-Etymological and dialectic method-खण्डान्वय-Inductive and deductive method of पतञ्जलि-Necessity of the partial adoption of the inductive method of teaching grammar-स्फोटवाद and the sentence-aspect of language-वाक्यपदीय and काशिकावृत्ति-I tsing on the ancient method of grammar teaching-Yuan Chwang on the spoken Sanskrit-Gradual development of Sanskrit from the Verbal into the Nominal style-Chief characteristics of the Nominal style-Dr Bhandarkar on the Nomial style-Corresponding change in the order of grammatical topics to be taught-Nominal part of Sanskrit first dealt with by the कातन्त्र-The same order of grammatical topics more or less followed by grmmarians up to भट्टोजी-Contribution of भट्टोजी to Grammar- वरदराज's three epitomes of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी and their order of grammatical topics- स्वामी दयानन्द on grammar teaching-गङ्गासहाय's सुगमकौमुदी and the concentric method of teaching grammar-Teaching of ready-made forms of nouns and verbs-Manuals on grammar stressing the कारक-Amalgamation of grammar and literature in some works-Practical conclusions arrived at from the foregoing treatment. pp *188-240*.

vi THE METHODS OF THE मीमांसा : Interpretation of वाक्य stressed-The sacrificial cult and the मीमांसा-Systematization of the मीमांसा by जैमिनि-Deductive logic and मीमांसा-अधिकरण of the पूर्वमीमांसा adopted by the वेदान्त-प्रमाण's, the analytico-synthetic method and categories of the न्याय-वैशेषिक adopted by कुमारिल and प्रभाकर-Characteristics of

methodology observable in the मीमांसा–Importance of the interpretative aspect of the मीमांसा–Contribution of the मीमांसा to the general linguistics–जातिवाद–अभिहितान्वय and अन्विताभिधान –A sentence, the unit of language–Five divisions of the Veda–Psychological process of भावना and खण्डान्वय–उत्पत्तिविधि –विनियोगविधि and its importance for the interpretation of literary and scientific works–प्रयोगविधि–अधिकारविधि–अपूर्वविधि, नियमविधि and परिसङ्ख्याविधि–मन्त्र, नामधेय, निषेध and अर्थवाद–पर्युदास–उपसंहार–Three kinds of अर्थवाद–विधि in alliance with अर्थवाद leads to the synthetic meaning or Purport–Analytico-synthetic methodology of the मीमांसा–Its wider application to वेदान्त, धर्मशास्त्र, व्याकरण and साहित्य–Its application to language teaching pp 240–283.

vii THE COMPARATIVE METHOD Scientific character of the combination of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण–Existence of comparative, critical and scientific methods in ancient times–Correlation of studies–बाण on comparative studies–Sanskrit authors and their works exemplifying the comparative method–Wider specialization pp 283–286.

viii THE SYNTHETIC METHOD THE METHODS OF THE वेदान्त–शङ्कराचार्य's scientific and synthetic exposition of the Vedanta with the help of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण–Relation of all Upanishadic sentences to ब्रह्मन्, the main goal–Identity of the Individual soul with ब्रह्मन्–शङ्कराचार्य indebted to बादरायण and गौडपाद–Six तात्पर्यलिङ्ग्s of the मीमांसक॰ adopted by शङ्कराचार्य–Recognition of श्रुति, युक्ति (तर्क) and स्वानुभव as प्रमाण॰–the hypothesis of अविद्या–Higher synthesis in the establishment of अद्वैत–Upanishadic sentences relating to कर्मन्, उपासना and ज्ञान useful for different grades of people–Three planes of existence postulated for gradual approach to the Ultimate Reality–Adwaita philosophy and modern scientific inventions– तटस्थलक्षण and

स्वरूपलक्षण of ब्रह्मन् based on the विवर्तवाद–Inadequacy of the theory of causation and inexplicability (अनिर्वचनीयता) of *the universe-Comprehensive aspect of the* विवर्तवाद–*The implications of the words* ' माया ' and ' मिथ्या '–The idea of माया in the Vedic literature-The empirical experience of माया illuminated by साक्षिन्–प्रमाता, प्रमाण and प्रमेय are the products of primal Nescience-Superimposition-The five-ख्यातिs–शङ्कराचार्य's comparative outlook-अध्यारोपापवाद based on the विवर्तवाद is a method of exposition-विवर्तवाद and अजातिवाद–Different methods (प्रक्रिया) of the exposition of ब्रह्मन्–विवर्तवाद, a comprehensive method-जाग्रत्, स्वप्न, सुषुप्ति and सत्तात्रय–Unbroken presence of साक्षिन् established by the अन्वयव्यतिरेक method-' तत्त्वमसि ' and जहदजहल्लक्षणा–Analytico-synthetic aspect of the methods of the Vedanta-शङ्कराचार्य's harmonization or higher synthesis of divergent systems-शङ्कराचार्य's method of refutation and comparative outlook-
pp 286-316.

IX THE HISTORICAL METHOD: History embedded in the Sanskrit literature-Absence of the Historical method-Use of प्रमाणs in the Historical method-Historical truth and literary truth-The modern idea of 'history'-Relativity of the historical truth from the philosophical point of view-Six stages of existence-Time and place, the predominant factors-Culture-Historical discipline or the amalgamation of the historical method with the critical and scientific methods-Causal relation of historical facts-analytico-synthetic process in the organization of historical facts-Importance of chronology-प्रमाणs used in the Historical method-The task of the historian-Application of the Historical method to different branches of knowledge-This method deserves to be adopted by the Shastris-Science of History and Philosophy of History-Superiority of the Hindu

Bibliography

Sanskrit Books

१ अद्वैतब्रह्मसिद्धि–काश्मीरकसदानन्दयति, २ अन्वयप्रबोध–ओङ्कारदास, ३ अभिधावृत्तिमातृका–मुकुल, ४ अर्थशास्त्र–कौटिल्य, ५ अर्थसङ्ग्रह–लौगाक्षिभास्कर, ६ अष्टाध्यायी–पाणिनि, ७ आपस्तम्बगृह्यसूत्र, ८ आश्वलायनगृह्यसूत्र, ९ उत्तररामचरित–भवभूति, १० ऋग्वेदप्रातिशाख्य, पटल १, ११ ऋग्वेदभाष्यभूमिका–सायण, १२ कविरहस्य–हलायुध, १३ काव्यचिन्ता–कालीपदतर्काचार्य, १४ काव्यप्रकाश–मम्मट, – १५ काव्यमीमांसा–राजशेखर, १६ काव्यादर्श–दण्डिन्, १७ काव्यानुशासन–हेमचन्द्र, १८ काव्यालङ्कारसूत्र–वामन, १९ काशिकावृत्ति–वामनजयादित्य [न्यास–जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि], २० कुमारसम्भव-कालिदास, २१ कौमुदी (सार, लघु, मध्य)–वरदराज, २२ चरकसंहिता, २३ जातकमाला–आर्यशूर, २४ तत्त्वसङ्ग्रह–शान्तरक्षित, २५ तर्कभाषा-केशवमिश्र, २६ तर्कसङ्ग्रहदीपिका–अन्नभट्ट, २७ दशरूपक–धनञ्जय, २८ दशोपनिषदः, २९ द्व्याश्रयकाव्य–हेमचन्द्र, ३० धर्माकूत–त्र्यम्बकरायमखिन्, ३१ ध्वन्यालोक–अभिनवगुप्तकृतलोचनसह, ३२ धातुकाव्य–नारायण, ३३ नाट्यशास्त्र–भरत (अभिनवभारतीसह), ३४ निरुक्त–यास्क (दुर्गाचार्यकृतटीकासह), ३५ न्यायकोश (झळकीकर–अभ्यंकर), ३६ न्यायसिद्धान्तमञ्जरी–जानकीनाथभट्टाचार्य, ३७. न्यायसिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि–विश्वनाथन्यायपञ्चानन, ३८ न्यायसूत्र–गौतम, ३९ पञ्चदशी–विद्यारण्य, ४० परमलघुमञ्जूषा–नागेश, ४१ परिभाषेन्दुशेखर (बाडेगावकरकृत अनुवाद), ४२ पाणिनीयशिक्षा, ४३ पातञ्जलयोगसूत्र, ४४ प्रस्थानभेद–मधुसूदनसरस्वती, ४५ ब्रह्मसूत्रशाङ्करभाष्य, ४६ भट्टिकाव्य–जयमङ्गलाटीकासह, ४७ भाषापरिच्छेद, ४८ माण्डूक्यकारिका–गौडपादशाङ्करभाष्य, ४९ मानसोल्लासवार्तिक–सुरेश्वराचार्य, ५० मालविकाग्निमित्र–कालिदास, ५१ मीमांसान्यायप्रकाश–आपदेव (अभ्यंकरकृतटीका), ५२ मीमांसापरिभाषा–कृष्णयज्वा, ५३ रघुवंश-

विमर्श–आर. कृष्णमाचारियर, ५४ रसगङ्गाधर, ५५ वाक्यपदीय, काण्ड १–२–भर्तृहरि, ५६ वाररुचसङ्ग्रह (त्रिवेन्द्रम्), ५७ वासुदेव-विजय–वासुदेव, ५८ विद्युल्लता (मेघसन्देशव्याख्या)–पूर्णसरस्वती, ५९ वेदाङ्गप्रकाश–दयानन्दसरस्वती, ६० वेदान्तपरिभाषा–धर्मराजाध्वरीन्द्र, ६१ वेदान्तसार–सदानन्द, ६२ वैयासिकन्यायमाला –भारतीतीर्थ, ६३ व्याकरणमहाभाष्य–पतञ्जलि, अध्याय १, ६४ शब्दव्यापारविचार–मम्मट, ६५ शृङ्गारतिलक–रुद्रभट्ट, ६६ श्रीशङ्कराचार्यविरचितप्रकरणग्रन्थसङ्ग्रह (अष्टेकर, पुणे), ६७ श्लोकयोजनिकोषाय–रघुराम, ६८ षड्दर्शनसमुच्चय–हरिभद्रसूरि, ६९ सज्जनेन्द्रप्रयोगकल्पद्रुम (चौखम्बा, काशी), ७० सत्यार्थप्रकाश–दयानन्दसरस्वती, ७१ सर्वदर्शनसङ्ग्रह–माधवाचार्य (अभ्यङ्करकृत टीका), ७२ सांख्यकारिका, ७३ साहित्यदर्पण–विश्वनाथ, ७४ सिद्धान्तकौमुदी–भट्टोजी दीक्षित, ७५ सिद्धान्तबिन्दु–मधुसूदनसरस्वती (अभ्यङ्करकृत टीका), ७६ सुगमकौमुदी–गङ्गासहाय (वेंकटेश्वर, मुंबई), ७७ सुश्रुतसंहिता, ७८ हर्षचरित–बाण.

Printed Books of the following Schools of Sanskrit Grammar

कातन्त्र, प्रक्रियाकौमुदी, मुग्धबोध, शाकटायनव्याकरण, सारस्वत, सिद्धहेमचन्द्रशब्दानुशासन.

Sanskrit Manuscripts

१ कातन्त्रलघुवृत्ति–भावसेनत्रैविद्यविरचित, २ कुमारसम्भव–नवनीतरामकृतशब्दार्थटीका, ३ प्रबोधचन्द्रिका–वैजल्भूपति, ४ बालबोध–नरहरि, ५ लघुवाक्यबोध, ६ वाक्यपदीय (सटीक)–गङ्गादास, ७ व्याख्यानप्रक्रिया–शशिदेव, ८ व्युत्पत्तिसार–माधवपण्डित, ९ शब्दरूपावलि (1612 & 1701 A D) १० सारसिद्धान्तकौमुदी–वरदराज.

English Books

1 Art of Teaching and Studying Languages-F Gouin; 2 Bilingualism-M West, 3 Biographia Literaria-S T Coleridge, 4 Classics in Education-A Report (H. M Stationery

Office, London), 5 Collected Works of Sir R G Bhandarkar-Vol I, 6 Constructive Survey of the Upanishads-R D. Ranade, 7 Dasa Rupaka (Eng Trans)-G C O Haas, 8 Defence of Poetry-P B Shelley, 9 Descriptive Catalogues of MSS on Grammar and Kavya, 10 Discourse on Method-Descartes, 11 Doctrine of Maya-P B Shastri, 12 Education in India (Modern Period)-K S Vakil, 13 Education, *its Data and First Principles*-Nunn, 14 *Groundwork of Educational Psychology*-Ross, 15 History of Indian Literature-M Winternitz, 16 History of Indian Logic-Satischadra Vidyabhushana 17 History of Indian Philosophy, Vols I & II, S N Dasa Gupta, 18 History of Sanskrit Literature-A B Keith, 19 History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol II-S K. De, 20 How to teach a Foreign Language-O Jespersen, 21 Indian Philosophy, Vols I and II-S Radhakrishnan, 22 Intermediate Logic-Welton & Monahan, 23 -Introduction to Social Psychology-McDougall, 24 Introduction to the Sahityadarpana-P V Kane, 25 Introduction to the Vedanta Sutras-G Thibaut, 26 Karm-Mimansa-A B Keith, 27 Language in Education-M West, 28 Language, its Nature, Development and Origin-O Jespersen, 29 Latin-its Place & Value in Education-C W Valentine, 30 Latin on the Direct Method-Rouse & Appleton, 31 Learning to Read a Foreign Language-M West, 32 Mimansa Nyaya Prakasa (Eng Trans)-F Edgerton, 33 Modern Language Instruction in Canada, Vols I & II (Publications of the American *and Canadian Committees on Modern Languages*), 34 *New* Teaching-' The Classics '-W H D Rouse, 35 Outline of Indian Philosophy-M Hiriyanna, 36 Outline of Psychology-McDougall, 37 Panini-Goldstucker, 38 Philosophy of Sanskrit Grammar-P. C Chakravarti, 39 Poona Sk College Prospectus-S K Belvalkar, 40 Principles of Language *Study*-H. E Palmer, 41 Principles of Literary Criticism-I A. Richards, 42 Progress of Education, Vols I to XII, 43 Progressive Methods of Teaching-Martin J. Stormzand, 44

Record of the Buddhist Religion–I tsing, 45 Scientific Study & Teaching of Languages–H E Palmer, 46 Six Systems of Indian Philosophy–MaxMuller, 47 Special Reports on Educational Subjects, Vols 2, 6, 8, 20, 28 (Board of Education, England), 48 Studies on Panini s Grammar–B Faddegon, 49 Substitution Tables (100)–H E. Palmer, 50 Systems of Sanskrit Grammar–S K Belvalkar, 51 System of the Vedanta–Paul Deussen, 52 Tarka–Sangraha–Y V Athalye, 53 Teaching, Vols II, V, VII, (Articles by V. P Bokil), 54 Teaching, its Nature & Varieties–B Dumville, 55 Theories of Rasa & Dhwani–A Sankaran, 56 This Language-Learning Business–H. E Palmer & H V Redmen, 57 Vedanta Sutras–Vireshwarananda, 58 Via Nova–W H S Jones, 59 Wilson Philological Lectures–R G Bhandarkar, 60 Yuan Chwang's Travels in India–T Watters

शुद्धिपत्रम् ।

पृष्ठम्	पङ्क्तिः	अशुद्धम्	शुद्धम्
३	९	अधस्तना	अधस्तनी
१८	८	वर्धिन्य–	वर्धिन्यः
१८	१४	आधुनिकः	आधुनिक–
२९	१३	अतोऽय	अतोऽयं
३७	९	प्रारम्भ अध्ययनार्हाणि	प्रारम्भेऽध्ययनार्हाणि
४१	१३	छात्रमनसु	छात्रमनःसु
४७	५	प्राप्स्येते	प्राप्स्यतः
४८	१९	नायकयो	नायकयोः
५२	४	पदनापि	पदेनापि
५७	१६	मित्यवधारयन्	मित्यवाधारयन्
५७	२८	सुवन्तप्रधान्	सुवन्तप्रधाना
५८	२३	सरस्वति	सरस्वती
५८	२६	ग्रन्था	ग्रन्थाः
५९	१३	सविशेप	सविशेपं
६५	२०	समीक्षां	समीक्षा
६५	२१	कारिका ।	कारिका
७०	२७	मुखेना समाश्रित	मुखेन समाश्रिता
७१	५	विविक्तवेन	विविक्तत्वेन
७४	१०	संमता	संमतं
७५	२०	वार्तिकग्रन्था–	वार्तिकग्रन्थाः
७५	२१	स्थिरीः	स्थिरी–
७६	१९	चोपजग्मौ	चोपजगाम
७८	२८	बलभिन्य	बलभिन्यः
७९	१९	वचनैरार्थं	वचनैः सार्थं
८०	१३	संहितायांकौटिलीयंशास्त्रे	संहितायां कौटिलीयार्थशास्त्रे

पृष्ठम्	पङ्क्तिः	अशुद्धम्	शुद्धम्
८२	८	तथा	यथा
८५	१	वट्टहन	वट्टहन्
८७	२०	कस्यचिद्दक्षीपविदुषो	श्रीविद्याशङ्करभारती–स्वामिनादाना
८८	१	माता इत्येव	माता, इत्येव
९१	२२	मार्गोपदृत्वा	मार्गोपदृष्टाः
९२	१२	ज्ञानाप्रधान्ये	ज्ञानप्राधान्ये
९२	१९	टिपन्यादिन्यो	टिपन्यादिन्यो

ERRATA

Page	Line	Incorrect	Correct
95	10	forms	form
96	35	Thorndyke	Thorndike
99	9	the longer is it	the longer it is
106	1	in the senior years	from the senior years
115	31	in coversation	in conversation
136	15	emotins	emotions
141	22	and the उद्दीपनविभाव	and उद्दीपनविभाव
143	24	consiouness	consciousness
159	27	assumas	assumes
166	22	यथ	यथा
176	2	for some-	for, some-
176	11	co-existance	co-existence
198	16	सांदर्भ	सादर्श
205	20	qenerlization	generalization
219	30	of the root मृ & दस्	of the roots मृ & दस्
223	14	a prose sentece	a prose sentence
243	17	पूर्नीनाया	पूर्नीनाया
243	22	स्पृद	स्पृर्द
251	12	wih the	with the

Page	Line	Incorrect	Correct
252	15	while principal thing	while the principal thing
255	20	whola मन्त्र	whole मन्त्र
258	28	अतिदश	अतिदेश
275	1	प्रतिषध	प्रतिषेध
276	3	प्रतिषध	प्रतिषेध
288	23	the seven	the six
291	6	श्रति	श्रुति
306	10	सविद्	संविद्
307	24	ihe negation	the negation
308	25	Upanishands	Upanishads
310	13	इश्वर	ईश्वर
310	15	इश्वर	ईश्वर
312	21	methd ology	methodology
343	30	froms	forms
347	13	adjecttves	adjectives
413	28	यथा	उभयथा
422	8	obiect	object
443	17	आङ्काक्षा	आकाङ्क्षा
451	28	श्लप	श्लेप
475	20	गाणी लक्षणा	गौणी लक्षणा
508	13	तात्पर्यांथ	तात्पर्यार्थ
541	3	by higher	by advanced
553	12	componud	compound
584	32	languge	language
607	9	rytional	rational
630	31	suceess	success
650	32	aer	are
653	12	A	As

[Misprints easily recognizable are left out]

संस्कृतानुशीलनविवेकः।

[The Problem of Sanskrit Teaching]

संस्कृताध्यापन-प्रश्नावलिः।

अयि गीर्वाणवागनुरागिणो महाभागाः! नैतदविदितं भवतां यद्-
खिलेऽप्यस्मिन्भारतवर्षे आङ्ग्लपाठशालास्वध्येतृभिर्नोलैरधीयमानेषु विविध-
विषयेषु 'संस्कृतम्' इत्यन्यतमो विषयः। आङ्ग्लपाठशालासु प्रायश्चतुर्थश्रेणीतः
संस्कृताध्यापनमारभ्यते। प्रतिसप्ताहं चत्वारिंशन्निमेषपरिमिताश्चत्वारः पञ्च
वा कालांशा (periods) लभ्यन्ते संस्कृताध्यापनाय। एतेभ्योऽनध्याय-
दिनानि व्यवकलनीयानि। एवं संस्कृतभाषाधिगमाय न पर्याप्तः कालो
लभ्यते छात्रैः। अपि चेदानीं न केवलं विप्राः किन्त्वविप्रा अपि संस्कृत-
मध्येतुमीहन्ते। गीर्वाणभाषा च सर्वेषामपि भारतीयानामनर्घ्यविचाररत्ना-
नामाकरः, आचारधर्माणामधिष्ठानं, नानाशास्त्रविद्याकलाकलापानां महोदधिः।
एतस्यां गीर्वाणवाङ्मयनिलीनायाः सुविचाराचाररूपायाः संस्कृतेः परि-
त्राणसमुच्चयार्थं गीर्वाणभाषाज्ञानं तदधिजिगांसुभ्योऽशेषेभ्यश्छात्रेभ्यो वितरणीय-
मित्यपरिहार्यं सञ्जातम्। तस्मात्सुकुमारमतीनां सकलजातीयकुमाराणां
गीर्वाणवाण्याः सुगमप्रचाराय सर्वैरपि प्रज्ञावद्भिर्निरतिशयप्रेमास्पदीभूतायाः
सुरभारत्या अध्यापने कापि सुनिर्दोषयुक्ता पद्धतिराविष्करणीया समाश्रयणीया
चेत्यत्र न कोऽपि सन्देहः। ये संस्कृताध्ययनमात्रेण शास्त्रेष्वसाधारण-
नैपुण्यमधिजिगमिषन्ति, न तेषां कृतेऽयं विमर्शः। ये तु गीर्वाणभारत्या-
मन्तर्हितं महाकाव्यनाटककथादिप्रबन्धानां सौन्दर्यं मूलास्वादनेनावगन्तु-
मिच्छन्ति, तेषां सामान्यच्छात्राणां कृतेऽयं प्रस्तावः। अधुना देववाचः
सार्वत्रिकप्रचारार्थं विशिष्टशास्त्राधीतिरपेक्षया काव्यनाटकादिवाङ्मयस्य तद्गत-
भाषायाश्चाध्यापनमेव हिततरं भवेदिति सुनिर्णीतम्। 'रन्दागीनानि

काव्यानि' इति वदता पण्डितप्रकाण्डाना कालस्तु समाप्तकल्पः, यतो विशिष्टशास्त्रनैपुण्य समासादयन्तो जना यत्र कुत्रापि काचित्का एव।

अधुनातने काले वैभवस्य परा कोटिमधिरूढायामपि सपत्नीस्थानीयाङ्ग्लभाषाया, सुरसरस्वतीसेवासक्ताः केचन विद्वद्वरेण्या प्रवक्तृत्व—ग्रन्थप्रकाशनादिभिर्विविधोपायैः सुरभारत्याः सार्वत्रिकप्रचारार्थं भारतीय सस्कृतिरक्षार्थं च प्रयतमानाः संलक्ष्यन्त। किन्तु गीर्वाणभारत्याः सार्वत्रिक प्रचार. सम्यगध्ययनाध्यापनाधीन इत्यपि न परोक्ष प्रेक्षावताम्। अक्लेशपुरस्सर रसोत्पादकमध्यापनमेवाध्ययनसौकर्याय गुणनिकया ज्ञानविवृद्धये च भवतीति विदित हेतुहेतुमद्भावोऽध्ययनाध्यापनयो। सम्प्रति भारतवर्षे बालाना सस्कृताध्यापनार्थं सस्कृतपाठशालासु मातृभाषोपयोगपूर्वकमुत्तरोत्तर सस्कृतभाषाव्यवहार प्रोत्साहयन्ती प्राचीनपण्डितपद्धतिरनुस्रियमाणा वर्तते, आङ्ग्लपाठशालासु चाङ्ग्लभाषाव्यवहारप्रमुखा व्याकरणाङ्ग्लानुवादप्रधाना भाण्डारकरपद्धतिरित्येतत्पद्धतिद्वय प्रायेण प्रचारबहुल परिदृश्यते। आदितः सस्कृतभाषाव्यवहारसौकर्यसम्पादयित्री तृतीया सवादपद्धतिस्तु पर्याप्तप्रयोगाभावान्निपुणाध्यापकविरहाच्च विरलत्वेनैवोपयुज्यते। आङ्ग्लपाठशालासु तु सस्कृताध्ययनस्य प्रायो दोषसङ्कुलत्वादरुचिकरत्वाच्च तत्रत्यास्छात्राः सस्कृताध्ययन विहायान्यभाषाभ्यासमवलम्बन्ते। अतश्चाङ्ग्लविद्यालयेषु सस्कृतभाषा प्रतिदिनमसितपक्षेन्दुकलेव क्षीणत्वमुपयातेत्यहो दौर्भाग्य सुरभारत्याः! प्रचलितबहुविधपद्धतिपरीक्षणपूर्वक पूर्वतनाना गुणानङ्गीकृत्यैव नूतनसरण्यनुसरण श्रेय इति निपुण विचार्य, सस्कृताध्ययनाध्यापनदुरवस्थाया दूरीकरणाय भारतवर्षीयविविधविदुषा समुचिताध्यापनपद्धतिविषयऽभिमतान्यभिकाङ्क्षता मया नानाप्रयोगमीमांसामूलिका 'सस्कृताध्यापनप्रश्नावलिः' वर्षपट्कात्प्रागुपनिबद्धा, या भिन्नप्रान्तस्थाना विदुषा शतकपञ्चकस्य सविधे प्रत्युत्तरप्राप्तये सप्रश्रयाभ्यर्थनापुरस्सर प्रेषिता, सस्कृतपत्रिकासु च प्रकाशिताऽऽसीत्। तदानीं गीर्वाणवाग्बद्धादराणा विदुषा त्रयोदशभि. सस्कृत भाषया, अष्टभिर्महाराष्ट्रभाषया, त्रिभिश्चाङ्ग्लभाषयेति केवल चतुर्विंशतिसङ्ख्याकैर्हस्तलेखरूपेण सानुग्रहमुत्तराणि प्रेरितानि मत्सविधे। सस्कृतोत्तराणि प्रेषयतां विदुषामेक. सयुक्तप्रान्तीयः, एको गुर्जरदेशीय', द्वौ मद्र. विभागस्थौ, नव च महाराष्ट्रियाः सन्ति। उपरितनविदुषा प्रतिप्रश्न

विविधोत्तराणि संस्कृताध्यापनपद्धतिजिज्ञासूनां सम्यग्बोधाय समुत्कृष्टपद्धतिग-वेषणायै च मत्प्रश्ने. साक 'बेळगाव'नगरस्थाया 'मधुरवाण्या' अयोध्यास्थ-साप्ताहिक-'संस्कृते' च प्रकाशितपूर्वाण्येव। तस्यवसरे सकलान्यपि प्रत्युत्तराणि अन्यरूपेण पृथक्तया प्रकाशयेरनेव।

संस्कृतभाषाजिज्ञासूनामाङ्ग्लविद्यालयच्छात्राणामध्यापने ये विवादाः प्रश्नाः समुद्भवन्ति तानुद्दिश्य मुद्रितपूर्वैव 'संस्कृताध्यापनप्रश्नावलिः' संस्कृतानुरागिणां समीक्षायै सम्यङ्निर्णयाय चात्र पुनरपि प्रकाश्यते। अन्य-च्चेयं प्रश्नावलिरत्रत्यप्रबन्धोपन्यासरूपैव, यतस्तदन्तर्गतानां केषाञ्चित्प्रश्नानां प्रत्युत्तराण्यपि लब्धैरग्रोपस्थापितेषु प्रबन्धेषु। अवस्तना प्रश्नावलिरन्यानपि विदुषः प्रत्युत्तरलेखनाय प्रेरयेत्, संस्कृतानुशीलनविषये युक्तायुक्तनिर्णायको विविधप्रबन्धगतो मदीयविमर्शश्च सरससरलाध्यापनरीतिगवेषणायोपयुक्ततरो विबुधजनसम्मतश्च भवेदिति बलवदाशास्यते।

सामान्यप्रश्नाः।

१ (अ) बालानां कृते या संस्कृताध्यापनपद्धतिः पुरातनकाला-दारभ्याद्य यावद् गीर्वाणभाषापण्डितैः समाश्रिता समाश्रीयते च, तस्याः स्वरूपं कीदृक्, किं च तद्गतविषयाणामानुपूर्व्यम्?।

(आ) उदीच्यभारतीयानां दाक्षिणात्यानां च पद्धत्योः के भेदसाम्ये?।

(इ) गीर्वाणभाषापण्डितानामध्यापनप्रणाल्यां के गुणा दोषा वा? सा प्रणाल्याङ्ग्लपाठशालास्वनुसिषमाणा चेत् किं परिवर्तनमिष्यते?।

२ त्रिदिव गतानां डॉ. भाण्डारकरमहोदयानां संस्कृताध्यापनपरिपाटी बालानां सुखबोधाय कियन्मात्र गुणावहा?।

३ इदानीं पाश्चात्यदेशेषु कैश्चिदध्यापकैः संस्कृततुल्यानां 'ग्रीक्-लॅटिन्' इत्येतयोः प्रचिरत्नप्रचारभाषाणामध्यापने तो तामेव भाषामाश्रित्य संवादपद्धतिं प्रयुज्यते। यस्याः कस्या अपि भाषाया अध्ययनाध्यापनविषये तदधिष्ठानभूतानि कानिचिद् व्यापकतत्त्वानि समवलम्ब्यमानानि वर्तन्त इति सन्दर्श्य तैस्तानि बालमनोविज्ञानानुसारेण (Child psychology) समुद्भावितानि संदृढीकृतानि च। तेषां तत्त्वानां तस्याः संवादपद्धत्याश्च (Conversational method) संस्कृताध्यापने कियानुपयोगो भावः?।

४ आङ्ग्लतृतीयश्रेणीतः संस्कृताध्ययनारम्भे क्रियमाणे कः प्रत्यवायः? तथा कृते चोपक्रमाध्यापनं कया रीत्या कार्यम्?।

व्याकरणम्।

५ (अ) किं भाषामुखेन व्याकरणं पाठनीयमुत व्याकरणमुखेन भाषा? कस्मात् कारणाच्च?।

(आ) *सामान्यच्छात्राणां संस्कृतवाङ्मयप्रवेशाय कियन्मात्रं व्याकरणज्ञानमपेक्ष्यते*, के व्याकरणविभागाश्चात्यावश्यकाः?।

(इ) सौकर्योपयोगदृष्ट्या व्याकरणविभागानामध्यापने कोऽनुक्रमः समीचीनः स्यात्?।

(ई) शब्दरूपावलिसमासचक्रयोः प्रस्तावः कदा कार्यः?।

(उ) *अध्यापकेन सुकोमलमतिभिश्छात्रैः किं व्याकरणनियमानुरोधेन* रूपसिद्धिः कारयितव्या, तैः पुस्तकस्थानि सिद्धरूपाण्येव कण्ठे करणीयानि वा?।

(ऊ) संस्कृताध्ययनाय मातृभाषाव्याकरणज्ञानस्य कियत्यपेक्षा?।

अनुवादः।

६ (अ) अपि 'मातृभाषयानुवाद' इति संस्कृतभाषाध्यापनस्यैकमेव साधनम्? अन्यान्यपि साधनानि स्युश्चेत्कानि तानि?।

(आ) संस्कृतस्य मातृभाषयानुवादः केषु केषु स्थलेषु हितमावहेत्?।

(इ) मातृभाषानुवादस्य का पद्धतिः श्रेयसी, संस्कृतशब्दानुसारिणी *मातृभाषासरण्यनुसारिणी वा? उभयोरप्युपयोगो यथासम्भवं कुत्र कथं* चेष्टः?।

(ई) मातृभाषाया आङ्ग्लभाषाया वा संस्कृतेऽनुवादः सामान्यच्छात्राणां कियत्परिमाणेनोपकारकः? उपकारकः स्याच्चेत्त आङ्ग्लविद्यालयेषु कतमस्या श्रेण्यामारब्धव्यः कया रीत्या चाध्यापयितव्यः?।

वाङ्मयाभ्यासः।

७ (अ) *उपक्रमावस्थायां किंस्वरूपं वाङ्मयं छात्रैरभ्यसनीयम्*, किं विश्लिष्टवाक्यानि (Disconnected sentences) उत कथासंवादवर्णनात्मकाः संश्लिष्टपरिच्छेदाः (Connected passages)? किमर्थं च?।

(आ) संस्कृतवाङ्मयं केन भाषासाधनेन (Medium) अध्यापयितव्यम्, संस्कृतभाषया मातृभाषया वा ?

(इ) वाङ्मयाध्यापनेऽध्यापकेन (१) प्रश्नप्रणाली (Questioning), (२) अनुवादप्रणाली (Translation), (३) कथनप्रणाली (Telling) चेत्येताः कुत्र कथं वा प्रयोज्याः ? प्रश्नकथनार्थविवरणानि कतरया भाषया कार्याणि, मातृभाषया संस्कृतभाषया वा ? किमर्थं च ? उभयभाषोपयोगः कर्तव्यश्चेत्कुत्र संस्कृतं प्रयोज्यं कुत्र च मातृभाषा ?।

(ई) कथाकाव्यसंवादवर्णनादीनामध्यापनं प्रत्येकं कया विभिन्नपरिपाट्या कार्यम् ? ।

(उ) वाङ्मयाध्यापने प्रायः कः कल्पोऽनुसर्तव्योऽध्यापकेन, कया दृष्ट्या च ? ।

(ऊ) गीर्वाणवाङ्मयगताः पर्यायशब्दाः (Synonyms), भिन्नार्थशब्दाः (Homonyms), वाक्सम्प्रदायाश्च (Idioms) कया पद्धत्याध्येतव्याः ? अमरकोशप्रस्तावः कदा कथं च कार्यः ? ।

पाठ्यपुस्तकानि ।

८ (अ) बालानां सुखबोधाय समीचीनानि संस्कृतपाठ्यपुस्तकानि कृच्छ्रेणैव लभ्यन्ते । नूतनेषु विरचयितव्येषु कानि तत्त्वानि लेखकैरात्मनः पुरः संस्थाप्यानि ? पुस्तकगतपाठानां क्रमविषये स्थूलतया किं तत्त्वमाश्रयणीयम् ?।

(आ) बालानां पाठ्यपुस्तकेषु कीदृशी भाषा के च विषया उपयोक्तव्याः ? अभिजातभाषायाः (Classical language) प्रस्तावस्तेषु कियन्मात्रं शक्यः ? अभिजातग्रन्थानामभ्यासः कतमस्यां श्रेण्यां कतमे वयसि वा साध्यः ? ।

(इ) संस्कृतवाङ्मयस्याः कथाकाव्यनाटकादयो विविधप्रकारा बालानां पाठ्यपुस्तकेषु श्रेण्यनुरोधेन यथाक्रमं कथं सन्निवेश्याः ? ।

(ई) पाठ्यपुस्तकेषु व्याकरणविभागाः कथं सविभाज्याः कया रीत्या च लेखनीयाः ? ।

(उ) आङ्ग्लभाषाया सुगमाभ्यासार्थेभ्यः पाठ्यपुस्तकेभ्योऽतिरिक्तानि साह्लोचितानि बहूनि स्थूलवाचनपुस्तकानि (Books for Rapid Reading) लभ्यन्ते।तादृशेषु संस्कृतभाषाया लेखितव्येषु कानि तत्त्वानि लेखकैरनुसर्तव्यानि?

सङ्कीर्णप्रश्नाः ।

९ 'अल्पारम्भः क्षेमकरः' इति न्यायात् कथावर्णनपत्रादिपरिच्छेदरूपेण प्रबन्धलेखनं छात्राणां कियद्धिताय भवेत्? अयं विषयः आङ्ग्लविद्यालयशिक्षाप्रणाल्यां कथं सन्निवेश्यः कया रीत्या चाध्याप्यः ?।

१० वाङ्मयव्याकरणयोः के भागाः कण्ठस्थाः करणीया अकरणीया वा? पाणिनीयसूत्राणामध्ययनं यथाप्रसङ्गमाङ्ग्लपाठशालासु कियन्मात्रं साध्यम्?।

११ आङ्ग्लविद्यालयेषु संस्कृतभाषायाः पाठ्यक्रमनिर्धारणे (Curriculum construction) का दृष्टिः समवलम्बनीया? केषु विभागेषु च पाठ्यक्रमपरिवर्तनमिष्टम्?।

१२ लौकिककार्येषु संस्कृतज्ञानां संस्कृतवाग्व्यवहारः सुसाध्यो दुःसाध्यो वा? दुःसाध्यश्चेत्केन कारणेन? सुसाध्यश्चेत् कैरुपायैः?।

१३ आङ्ग्लमहाविद्यालयेषु प्रधानत्वेन संस्कृतमधीत्यापि विश्वविद्यालयोपाधिधारिणोऽध्यापका अध्यापनेऽन्यत्र वा संस्कृतभाषया सौकर्येण सम्भाषणादिव्यवहारं कर्तुं न पारयन्ति। तेषामध्यापने संस्कृतभाषाव्यवहार इष्टोऽनिष्टो वा?। इष्टश्चेदध्यापकैर्भाषाव्यवहारनैपुण्यं कथं सम्पाद्यम्?।

१४ संस्कृतशिक्षकाणां संस्कृतवाग्व्यवहारक्षमत्वाय महाविद्यालयीने संस्कृतपाठ्यक्रमे किं परिवर्तनमिष्यते?।

संस्कृताध्ययनदुरवस्था तद्दूरीकरणोपायाश्च ।

कतिपयवत्सरेभ्यः प्राग्भारतवर्षस्य नानादिग्भागेषु प्राचुर्येण समुपालभ्यन्त गीर्वाणभाषाप्रवीणाः पण्डितप्रकाण्डा ये सुबोधमधुरया गीर्वाणवाण्या सल्लपन्तः श्रोत्रसुखमुत्पादयन्ति स्म। नानाशास्त्रपारावारीणानां तेषां तेषां पूर्वतनपण्डितप्रवराणां गीर्वाणवाग्विलासः स्मारं स्मारमद्यापि सुखदो

-लामध्यारोहति चेतः। प्राक्कालीना परिपाटी त्वियं यद्दाक्षिणात्याः पण्डिता उदीच्यभारतं गत्वा तत्रात्मनोऽगाधपाण्डित्येन प्रथितयशसः सञ्जाताः। स्वकीयसुरसरस्वतीनैपुण्येन प्रगाढशास्त्रावगाहनेन च वाराणसीमप्यलङ्कुर्वाणाः सन्ति दाक्षिणात्याः पण्डितप्रवरा इति महद्गौरवास्पदम्। दक्षिणभारते त्वधुना का दुर्गतिर्दृष्टिसरणिमायाति! अत्र न केवलं हीनत्वमापन्नाऽस्मदीया निसर्गमधुरा देवभारती, अपितु केचनाधुनिकपण्डितम्मन्याः प्रलपन्ति यद् "इयं देववाक् पञ्चत्वं गता। आधुनिकभाषाविचाराणामपेक्षया सा न्यूनतमा, निकृष्टतमा च। किं प्रयोजनमस्मदीयमेतादृश्या मृतभाषया?" इति। एतत्प्रलपितश्रवणेन दूयेत कस्यापि गीर्वाणवागनुरागिणश्चेतः। सौभाग्यस्याय विषयो यदेतस्मिन्नप्यननुकूले काले कैश्चिदङ्गुलिमेयैः पण्डितैरद्यावधि दक्षिणभारते गीर्वाणभाषागतविविधशास्त्राणां पठनपाठनयोः परम्पराऽनाडम्बरपूर्वकमविच्छिन्नत्वेन प्रचालिता। किन्तु सुरसरस्वतीशेवधिरूपास्ते ते प्राचीनपण्डिताः प्रायः प्रतिदिनं कालवशत्वमुपयान्ति, ये च विरलत्वेनोपलभ्यमानास्ते वयसश्चरमभागं प्राप्ता इति हेतोः संस्कृताध्ययनपरम्परा छिन्नप्राया संवृत्तेत्यहो दौर्भाग्यं विबुधवाण्याः। एतत्कारणश्रेणिवशादेवेयं सुरभारती मुमूर्षुत्वमापन्ना, एषा च तस्या दुरवस्था "अहो कष्टं सापि प्रतिदिनमधोऽधः प्रविशति" इति भर्तृहरिवचनं स्मारयति। अद्यत्वे आङ्ग्लभाषाध्ययनस्यापरिहार्यापेक्षा वर्तत इति विवादातीतमेव। किन्तु संस्कृतभारत्याः समुचिताध्ययनेनापि लब्धावकाशेन भाव्यं, यतो भारतीयसंस्कृतेः परिज्ञानं संस्कृतभाषामुद्राधिष्ठितमेव।

उदीच्यभारते संस्कृताध्ययनविषये यावान्समादरो दृश्यते न तावान्मोहमयीविभागे। उदीच्यभारते प्रतिमण्डलं संस्कृतपरीक्षासमितिभिः शास्त्रप्रावीण्यलब्धये विविधपरीक्षा विहिताः सन्ति। निर्धनत्वादाङ्ग्लभाषामध्येतुमक्षमाः पादोनलक्षसङ्ख्याकाश्छात्राः प्रतिवर्षमेताः परीक्षाः समुत्तरन्ति। किन्त्वेतादृशे संस्कृताध्ययने छात्राणां न समधिकं प्रलोभनं दृश्येत, यावत्परीक्षोत्तीर्णा राजशासनद्वारा जीविकोपाया नोपकल्पिताः स्युः। आङ्ग्लोपाधिधारिभिर्यावती वृत्तिर्लभ्यते तावत्यपि संस्कृतपण्डितैर्नाधिगम्यत इति महद्विषादस्थानम्। उदीच्यभारते गीर्वाणभाषाभिवृद्ध्यर्थमन्येऽपि विविधोपायाभिनन्द्यन्ते। तत्र संस्कृतभाषामाध्यमव्यवहारचरणैः पण्डितप्रवरैः

सुरसरस्वतीसंवर्धनोपायभूतानि समेलनानि विधीयन्ते विविधा नियतकालिकपत्रिकाश्च प्रकाश्यन्ते । केचिदमन्दोत्साहाः पण्डिता गीर्वाणभाषाया राष्ट्रभाषात्वमापादयितुमपि प्रयतन्ते, येषां समुद्यमं क्षाराम्बुधेर्मधुबिन्दुनिपातनेन माधुर्यापादनमिवासुकरं मन्यमानाः केचिदन्येऽपि सन्ति ।

मोहमयीविभागे न खैतादृशी स्थितिः । अत्र संस्कृतपाठशालाना संस्कृतपरीक्षाणां च वैरल्यादाङ्ग्लपाठशालामहाविद्यालयेषु गैर्वाण्या यज्ज्ञानमधिगम्यते तत्तु गाधोदककल्प, यतः संस्कृतविषयः प्राय आङ्ग्लमहाविद्यालयेष्वाङ्ग्लभाषाद्वारैवाधीयतेऽध्याप्यते च । संस्कृतमधिकृत्य विश्वविद्यालयपरीक्षास्वाङ्ग्लभाषाया प्रश्नाः पृच्छयन्ते, तेषां प्रत्युत्तराणि चाङ्ग्लभाषयैव प्रायो लिख्यन्ते छात्रैः । संस्कृतानुवादार्थं परीक्षासु दीयमान आङ्ग्लभाषापरिच्छेदो विरलैरेवानूद्यते संस्कृते । विश्वविद्यालयपरीक्षासु संस्कृतप्रबन्धलेखनविषयकाणां प्रश्नानामत्यन्ताभाव एव । संस्कृतनैपुण्यदर्शक विश्वविद्यालयोपाधिं लभमानाना छात्राणा स्तोकाद्येनापि पाणिनीयपरिभाषापरिचयो न भवति । कैश्चिच्छात्रैः पाठ्यत्वेन निर्दिष्टाः संस्कृतमूलग्रन्था अपि नाभ्यस्यन्ते, किमुत तत्सम्बन्धिनः संस्कृतटीकाग्रन्थाः । संस्कृतमूलग्रन्थाध्ययन विनाऽऽङ्ग्लभाषानिष्ठाना ग्रन्थानुवादटिप्पण्यादीना वाचनमात्रेण ते सम्यक्तयोत्तीर्णा भवन्ति । येषां चाङ्ग्लभाषाया प्रावीण्यं स्यात्त एव संस्कृतपरीक्षासु समधिकगुणोल्लब्धुमीशते । संस्कृतवर्णोच्चारानजानाना एतादृशाश्छात्राः संस्कृतगद्यपद्यपरिच्छेदान् समीचीनतया प्रोच्चैर्वाचयितु न प्रभवन्ति, यतस्तेषां सुविशदवर्णोच्चारपूर्वको वाचनाभ्यास आङ्ग्लपाठशालामहाविद्यालयेषु कदाचिदेव भवति । एतादृश्या पद्धत्या संस्कृतनैपुण्योपाधिं लभमाना जना यदाऽऽङ्ग्लपाठशालासु गीर्वाणभाषाशिक्षकपदे नियुज्यन्ते तदा तेषामध्यापने कियती रतिः को वा गुणः स्यात् ? सम्यङ्ज्ञानापेक्षयाऽन्धपरम्परान्यायेन यया कयाप्यध्यापनरीत्या छात्राणा परीक्षासमुत्तरणमेवादिम प्रयोजनमेतेषां शिक्षकाणाम् ।

प्रत्याङ्ग्लविद्यालय संस्कृताध्यापकपदे प्राचीनपण्डितो नियोक्तव्य इत्यासीत्पूर्वं राजशासनम् । मातृभाषया गीर्वाणभाषया वाऽध्यापयितु क्षमा अप्येते शास्त्रिप्रवरा आङ्ग्लभाषाज्ञानाभावात्तद्भाषागत भाण्डारकरमहो-

दयविरचितसंस्कृतपाठ्यपुस्तकद्वयं पाठयितुमक्षमाः । छात्रैः परीक्षाप्रश्नोत्तराणि
त्वाङ्ग्लभाषया लेखितव्यानीति नियमसद्भावात्प्राचीनपण्डितानुपयुक्ता-
न्मन्वाना आङ्ग्लोपपदधारिणः शिक्षकाः शास्त्रिणां विषयेऽनादरभावमभज-
न्त । आङ्ग्लभाषागतसंस्कृतपाठ्यपुस्तकद्वयमध्यापयितुमीषदाङ्ग्लभाषाध्ययनं
शास्त्रिणामवश्यकरणीयत्वेनापतितमित्यासीद् व्युत्क्रमः संस्कृताध्यापनविषये ।
संस्कृताध्यापने शास्त्रिप्रवराणामपेक्षयाऽऽङ्ग्लोपपदधारिणोऽध्यापकाननुपयुक्त-
तरानीक्षमाणैर्भाण्डारकरमहोदयैः प्रथमपाठ्यपुस्तकस्य प्रस्तावे लिखितं यत्
"Sanskrit would be considerably more easy than it is, if
there were men educated in our English Colleges to teach
it."—अत्र वयमेतद्वक्तुकामा यद्भाण्डारकरमहोदयदृशा सन्तु नाम केचि
दोषाः शास्त्रिणामध्यापने । किन्तु तेषां गीर्वाणभाषाज्ञानेन साकमाङ्ग्लोप-
पदधारिणां संस्कृतज्ञानं न मात्रयापि तुलामर्हति । उपरितनमतमनुसृत्यैव
सम्प्रति शास्त्रिण आङ्ग्लविद्यालयेषु क्वाचित्कत्वेनाध्यापकपदे नियुज्यन्ते, ये
च नियुक्तपूर्वास्तेऽप्यचिरादेव विश्रान्तिवृत्तिभाजो भविष्यन्ति । अधुना तु
मातृभाषायामनूदितयोरपि भाण्डारकरकृतपुस्तकयोराङ्ग्लोपपदधारिणाम-
ध्यापकानां च संस्कृतानुरागोत्पादने चिरानुभवसिद्धमकिञ्चित्करत्वमेव
प्रत्यक्षीक्रियते ।

वाराणसीबिहारकलिकातालवपुरमद्रादिविभागेषु यथा प्राच्यशास्त्र-
नैपुण्यसम्पादनार्थं विश्वविद्यालयद्वारा राजशासनद्वारा च विविधपरीक्षाः
परिकल्पिताः संस्कृतमहाविद्यालया वा प्रतिष्ठापितास्तथा मोहमयीविभागे
तदर्थं न केऽप्युपायाश्चिन्तिताः । चिन्तिताः स्युश्चेत्ते दरिद्राणां मनोरथा इव
विफलता गताः । किमिदमौदासीन्यं मन्दादरो वा मोहमयीविभागस्थानां
गीर्वाणवाणीविषये । महदेतत्सौभाग्यं यत्पुण्यपत्तने 'वेदशास्त्रोत्तेजकसभा
'वेणुग्रामे' च मधुरवाणीरसिकावलम्बनमित्येते गीर्वाणभाषासमुत्कर्षोपायभूताः
केचित्समुद्यमाः प्रचलिताः सन्ति । किन्तु समुचिताश्रयं विना ते कथं
पुष्कलतामावहेयुः ? । गीर्वाणभाषा प्राच्यविद्या वा निमित्तीकृत्याङ्ग्लभाषा-
मुखेनैव प्रस्तुताः प्रयत्नास्तु कियन्मात्रं गीर्वाणभाषोपकारका इत्यत्र विषये
विदैरेव निर्णेयः ।

प्राचीनग्रन्थार्थं प्रतिपादयन्ति, ऐतिह्याचारविधीनां किं रहस्यं कथयन्तीत्येतदपि गीर्वाणभाषाध्यापकेन संद्रष्टव्यम्। एतच्च ज्ञानं यथा शिष्याणां श्रुतिविषयं दृष्टिविषयं च सुगमतयाऽऽगच्छेत्तथा तेन प्रयतनीयम्। एवमेव पूर्वाचारविचाराणामाधुनिकाचारविचाराणां च सम्बन्धश्छात्राणां मतिं सौकर्येणाधिरोक्ष्यति। भारतीयाचारधर्मस्य सम्यग्बोधनायाध्यापकेन च्छात्रेभ्यः प्राचीनैतिह्यान्यपि यथावसरं कथनीयानि। काव्यविवरणसमकालमेव यथासम्भवं कविचरितानि कथयितव्यानि। कदाचित्काव्यनाटकानां सारग्राहिणी समीक्षापि कार्या। सा यथा—काव्यनिर्माणकाले किं कवेर्मनसोऽधिष्ठानं, के के गुणाश्च तस्य तस्य कवेः प्रतिभाविशेषं प्रदर्शयन्तीत्येतेषां विषयाणां सम्यगालोचनमपि प्रत्येकमध्यापकेन यथाप्रसङ्गमनुष्ठेयम्। प्रौढच्छात्राध्यापने न वाक्यानां श्लोकानां वा वाच्यार्थमात्रज्ञापनं पर्याप्तं भविष्यति, किन्तु शब्दान्तर्हितो यः कोऽप्यपूर्वो व्यञ्जनारूपोऽर्थस्त रुच्या स्वयमेव प्रथममास्वाद्य पुनः स शिष्याणां पुरतः सकौशलमाविष्कार्यः। यद्येतत्सकलमप्यध्यापकस्य कर्तव्यत्वेनापतति तर्हि तेन यथानिर्देशं पूर्वसूरिग्रन्थानधीत्य ते तेऽध्यापकगुणाः सम्पादनीया एव।

नाटकवाचने शिक्षकेण विशिष्टपदवाक्प्रयोगाः सवादप्रकारा वाक्प्रचाराश्च सविशेषमभ्यसनीया येन तदानीन्तनानां सवादरीतिं विज्ञाय स्वीये सम्भाषणे लेखने वा नाटकस्थानि सुश्लिष्टपदानि सामीचीन्येन प्रयोक्तुं स प्रभविष्यति। एषा ग्रन्थाध्ययननिरतिरध्यापनकालेऽविरतस्यन्दिन्या मधुरभाषया परिणमेत्फलदायिनी च भवेच्छात्राणामित्यत्र नास्ति संशयलेशावकाशः। यावन्मात्रमध्यापकः पूर्वसूरिग्रन्थाध्ययननिरतः स्यात्तावन्मात्रं तस्य वाक्पाटवं प्रागल्भ्यमुपागत्य च्छात्राणां संस्कृताध्ययने रतिं जनयिष्यति। अभ्यासेनैवैतत्सर्वं सुकरं भवति। 'स्वाध्यायप्रवचनाभ्यां न प्रमदितव्यम्' इत्युपनिषद्वचनमध्यापकैः सततमभ्यसनशीलैर्भाव्यमित्यस्मत्सिद्धान्तमुपोद्बलयति।

अन्यदपि किञ्चिद्वक्तव्यमत्र यद्गीर्वाणभाषाध्यायिनः प्रायो विविक्तसेविनो मितभाषिणश्च दृश्यन्ते। विशेषतोऽभिधेयमत्र यत् "प्रायः समानविद्याः परस्परयशःपुरोभागाः" इति कालिदासोक्तेर्निदर्शनभूता आत्मानमेव कृतार्थं मन्यमानाः केचन प्राच्यपण्डिताः सरसग्रन्थविरचनमतिं विहाय यत्र कुत्राप्यन्येषामपरोक्तस्व्यक्तावेव स्वरुचिमाविष्कुर्वन्ति। महदेतच्चित्रं यत्साधुयाः

परस्परकुत्सापरितुष्टाश्चेमे परेषा वैदुष्यविषयेऽकारणमेव कृपणमतित्व प्रकटयन्ति, तेषामध.पातनायापि यथा कथञ्चित्प्रयतन्ते च । अधुनातनकालनिदाघेन कृशीभूताया सस्कृतवाक्स्रोतस्विन्यामिय प्रवृत्तिर्न कमपि गुणमावहति, प्रत्युतात्मनाशायैव कल्पते । अतः सर्वैः सस्कृतानुरागिभिः ' सहतिः कार्यसाधिका ' इति वचन सस्मृत्य स्वदोषपरिमार्जनाय पतत्त्रिसञ्चारन्यायेन गीर्वाणवाक्प्रचाराय च प्रयतितव्यम् । तैः प्रतिनगर सस्कृतवाक्सभाः सस्थापयितव्याः, यासु कमपि रुचिरविषयमधिकृत्य सस्कृतव्याख्यानानि सविधेयानि, रम्याः सस्कृतकथाः कथनीयाः, सस्कृतनाटकस्थाः समुत्कृष्टप्रवेशाश्च नाटयितव्याः । तादृशीषु समासु छात्राणामप्यध्यापकैः सार्धं सविभागोऽस्तु येनाध्यापकानामभ्यासनपाटव वृद्धिं प्राप्स्यति छात्राणामपि सस्कृताध्ययने समुचितरुचिरुत्पत्स्यते च ॥

प्राच्यप्रतीच्यशिक्षापद्धतिसमीक्षा ।

भारताभ्युदयसाधिका का शिक्षापद्धतिर्मवेदित्यत्र विषये बहवः पाश्चात्यविद्याविद्भन्यमानाश्चिन्तनचतुरा जना विविधोपायाश्चिन्तयन्ति । किन्तु यस्यां भाषामञ्जूषाया भारतीयसस्कृतिरत्नान्यन्तर्हितानि तस्या गीर्वाणवाण्या मृतत्वहेतवे प्रमाणीकृत्य पाश्चात्यैकविद्याप्रचारमेव परमोन्नत्युपाय मन्यमाना इमे जनास्तरोर्मूल परित्यज्य शाखा बलेन सिञ्चन्ति, स्वसिरो विस्मृत्यान्येषां कृतकपुस्तत्व परिगृह्णन्ति, प्रकृतिं परित्यज्य या विकृतिमुररीकुर्वन्तीत्युक्तिर्न प्रायोऽसामञ्जस्यमावहेत् । विज्ञातसुरभारतीगौरवेषु सन्तत च सुरवागध्ययनसंसक्तचेत.सु सत्स्वपि केषुचित्प्राश्चात्यपण्डितेषु, प्रतीच्यविद्यैकशरणाः केचन भारतीयविद्वांसो मेकॉलेमहोदयोदीर्णानि मायिकवचांसि श्रद्दधानाः प्राच्यविद्यापरिवादरताश्च परिदृश्यन्त इत्यहो कालवैपरीत्यम् । एतस्मिन्नपि समये केचन नयनगोचरीभवन्ति विरलाः सस्कृतपण्डिताः, ये वैदुष्यविभू-

पिता अपि विनीतवेषाः, सरस्वतीनिकेतनायमाना अपि निजगुणप्रख्यापने मूकाः, विविधशास्त्राध्ययने कृतभूरिपरिश्रमा अप्यल्पधनपर्याप्तधनाः, अधना अपि मानधनाः, पाश्चात्यैकपक्षपातिभिश्च तृणाय मन्यमानाः सन्ति।

सन्तु नाम केऽपि दोषाः संस्कृतविदुषाम्। पदपदार्थव्याख्यानपुरस्सरं पाठ्यग्रन्थविवेचने तेषामप्रतिमैव प्रतिभा विद्योतत इत्यत्र नास्ति सन्देहलवोऽपि। प्राच्यानामध्ययनाध्यापनपद्धतिर्बहुशो मुखाधिष्ठिता, न केवलं ग्रन्थाधिष्ठिता। तेषां न तथा पल्लवग्राहिपाण्डित्ये समादरो, यथा विद्यते मूलग्राहिपाण्डित्ये, येन ते ग्रन्थगतं प्रधानविषयं यथायथं प्रवक्तुं पारयन्ति। एवैव प्राच्यविद्वद्गुणसम्पदतन्द्रितेन मनसा परिरक्षणीयेति सुतरामावश्यकम्।

नात्रास्माभु प्राच्यपण्डितगुणैकपक्षपातित्वं स्वदोषनिगूहनपरत्वं वाऽध्यारोपयन्तु मनीषिणः। प्राच्यगुणेष्विव प्रतीच्यगुणेष्वपि वयं बद्धादराः। यथा पाश्चात्यपण्डिताः संस्कृतग्रन्थाध्ययने सारग्राहिणीं विचिकित्सापद्धतिं समवलम्ब्य स्थलकालेतिवृत्तादिविमर्शपूर्वकं गवेषणापूर्णान् सिद्धान्तानुपपादयितुमीशते, न तथा पौरस्त्यपण्डिताः। प्राच्यविद्वांसो विश्लेषणपद्धतिमाश्रित्य काव्यगतश्लोकानामेकैकशो रसभावालङ्कारविवरणे मतिप्रकर्षमाविष्कुर्वन्ति। पाश्चात्यरसज्ञास्त्वन्यादृशीमेव काव्यसमीक्षापद्धतिं प्रकटयन्ति। संश्लेषणपद्धत्या तस्य तस्य कवेः काव्यजातमालोड्य शब्दान्तर्हिता विविधप्रवृत्तीः सपरीक्ष्य च तस्य तस्य मनसो मूलाधिष्ठानं सङ्कलनेनाभिव्यङ्क्तुं काव्यरसमास्वादयितुं च ते क्षमाः। दर्शनशास्त्रेषु तौलनिकीमैतिहासिकीं च पद्धतिमङ्गीकृत्य कल्पयमतयः सन्तोऽपि ते विभिन्नसंस्कृतिसाधर्म्यं तत्तत्सिद्धान्ततुल्यत्वं च प्रदर्शयितुं प्रयतन्ते। संस्कृतानुशीलनमूलकं नूतनं भाषाशास्त्रं समुद्भाव्य तद्बलेन वेदवाङ्मयार्थनिर्धारणे कृतसमुद्यमाः पाश्चात्याः प्रस्खलन्तोऽपि प्रशंसाभाजनं खलु। अद्यत्वे तु 'स्थाणुरयं भारहारः किलाभूदधीत्य वेदं न विजानाति योऽर्थम्' इत्युक्तिं सार्थतां नयता वैदिकधर्मानुयायिना वर्धत एव वेदार्थविषयेऽज्ञानविलसितम्। अधुना भारतीयपण्डितानां मतिर्वेदाङ्गानामेकदेशमात्राध्ययने पर्यवसिता, दरीदृश्यते, न तु साक्षाद्वेदाध्ययने। विरला एव तादृशा अनेकशास्त्रजलपूतमानसाः पदवाक्यप्रमाणज्ञा विद्वद्वरेण्या यादृशाः पूर्वं प्राचुर्येणाध्यगम्यन्त। वर्तमान-

शताब्द्यां भारते प्रायः पदज्ञापकव्याकरणैकशास्त्रस्य, वाक्यज्ञापकमीमांसैक-शास्त्रस्य प्रमाणज्ञापकन्यायशास्त्रमात्रस्य वाऽध्ययने यापितबहुवत्सराः पण्डिताः समजायन्त । पौरस्त्यविद्वांसश्च मूलग्रन्थविवेचने निपुणतमाः सन्तोऽपि ग्रन्थसम्बन्धिनः स्थलकालेतिवृत्ताद्यानुषङ्गिकविषयान्न जानन्ति, न वा तत्र समवदधते । तेऽभिप्रयन्ति यद् "नैतादृशैर्विषयैरस्मदीयं प्रयोजनम् । एतदन्वेषणं नूनं काकदन्तगवेषणमेव जलताडनप्रकारो वा । पुष्परसपानं परित्यज्य किमेतया कुसुमदलपरिगणनया" इति । पक्षैकावलम्बिनी नैषा प्राच्यपण्डितोक्तिरुपादेयतामर्हतीति सुव्यक्तमेव । अतो दृष्टिसङ्कोचं दूरीकुर्वाणा विततालोकं विदधाना च प्रतीच्यानामध्ययनाध्यापनपद्धतिः पौरस्त्यपण्डितैरवश्यमभ्युपगन्तव्या ।

* एतस्य तु प्रतीच्यपद्धतिविज्ञानस्याऽऽङ्ग्लभाषादिगतग्रन्थनिष्ठत्वात् तत्पद्धतिपरिचयस्तत्तद्भाषाज्ञानमपेक्षते । विभिन्नभाषाधिगमस्य पुनः कतिपयजनानामेव सुकरत्वात् तत्तद्भाषानभिज्ञानां कृते विविधभाषाकुशलैस्तत्पद्धतिविद्भिः संस्कृतेन मातृभाषया वा तादृशग्रन्थविरचने मतिः कार्या, येन संस्कृतादिवाङ्मयमपि परमां स्फीतिमियात् । इदं त्ववधेयं यन्मूलग्रन्थाध्ययनादृते पद्धतिप्रयोगविज्ञानमात्रमकिञ्चित्करमेव । संलक्ष्यते हि मोघत्वं मूलग्रन्थाध्ययनविहीनस्य पद्धतिविज्ञानमात्रस्य पाश्चात्यसम्प्रदायिषु विश्वविद्यालयेषु, यत्र संस्कृताध्ययनेऽप्याङ्ग्लभाषाव्यवहारस्य सर्वमूर्धन्यत्वात्संस्कृतमूलग्रन्थानां पाङ्क्तज्ञानं न यथावदधिगन्तुं पार्यते । पर्याप्तसंस्कृतज्ञानाभावेऽपि पाश्चात्यग्रन्थैकशरणास्तत्रत्या भारतीयच्छात्राः पद्धतिविज्ञानवशादेव संस्कृतपरीक्षाः सम्यक्समुत्तीर्य प्राच्यविद्वद्दृशा पल्लवग्राहिपण्डितकोटिमाटीकन्त इति नितरामुपपन्नमेव ।

नात्र केनापि मन्तव्यं यत्कृपणमतिता मतप्रदिग्धता वा प्राच्यविदुषामेव व्यवच्छेदिकेति । उपरितनकोटिमवगाहमाना आङ्ग्लोपपदधारिणोऽपि गाधज्ञानवशाद् गीर्वाणवाणीं शास्त्रिणोऽन्यांश्चानुपयुक्तान्मन्वाना दृष्टिसङ्कोचं दुराराध्यत्वं च प्रकटयन्तीत्यतः पाश्चात्यपद्धतिविज्ञानमेव केवलमालोकं विस्तारयतीति मास्तु कस्यापि मिथ्याभ्रमः । परन्तु प्राच्यपण्डितानां प्राचीनसम्प्रदायसंरक्षकमनेकसंशयोच्छेदि परोक्षार्थदर्शकं च शास्त्राध्ययन-

परायं, न पुनः परम्परोच्छेदि प्रत्यक्षार्थमात्रदर्शकं दुराराध्यताजनकं च पाश्चात्यसम्प्रदायानुसारित्वमिति नो मतिः। 'उपयुक्तत्व'—पदेनोदरभरणक्षमत्वमेवावबुध्येत चेदिदानीं संस्कृतविद्येवाङ्ग्लविद्यापि कथमनुपयुक्तत्वं न भजेत। तदर्थं श्रवितविपुलधना आङ्ग्लोपाधिधारिणः कति जना पर्याप्तजीविकां लब्धुं प्रभवन्तीत्याङ्ग्लविद्याभिमानिनः प्रष्टव्याः। तस्मादुपयुक्तत्वविषये प्राच्यविद्या प्रतीच्यविद्या चासंशयं तुल्यकक्षतामेवाधिरोहत इत्यस्मदाशयः।

महदेकं विषादस्थानं यत्संस्कृतवाङ्मयमधिकृत्य केचन भारतीयपण्डिता अपि नूतनसिद्धान्तसमन्वितान् स्वीयग्रन्थानाङ्ग्लभाषयैव विरचयन्ति, येन सुरभारती वञ्चितोपोषिता सती मुमूर्षुत्वमापद्यते। अद्यत्वे पद्यपरिपुष्टे संस्कृतवाङ्मये न तावती पद्यप्रणयनस्यावश्यकता प्रतिभाति, यावती सरससरलानां गद्यकाव्यकथानामभिनवसिद्धान्तसमेतानां गद्यप्रबन्धानां च। अतो 'गद्यं कवीनां निकषं वदन्ति' इति वचनमनुस्मृत्य तत्तद्वाङ्मयविधानिपुणैः सुरसरस्वतीभिषःसाधने प्रयतितव्यम्। एतद्ग्रन्थविरचनायाम्यादृशा एव पण्डिता अपेक्ष्यन्ते, ये काव्यशास्त्रादीनां प्रगाढानुशीलनप्रभावात्संस्कृताभिभाषणलेखनवैदग्ध्यं प्रकाशयन्तः पाश्चात्यपद्धतिप्रयोगपटवोऽपि भविष्यन्ति। एवं प्रतीच्यपण्डितपद्धतिसनाथं प्राच्यानां मूलग्राहिपाण्डित्यमनल्पफलाय कल्पेतेत्यत्र नास्ति संशयावकाशः।

अतो दोषवर्जमुभयविधविद्यागतानां गुणानां परिरक्षणोपायभूतानि कानिचन वस्तून्यत्र प्रस्तूयन्ते—

१ साहित्यव्याकरणन्यायमीमांसावेदान्तधर्मशास्त्रायुर्वेदादिविषयाणां सम्यगध्ययनाय वाराणसीविहारकालिकास्थानलवपुरमद्रादिविभागेषु यथा संस्कृतमहाविद्यालया राजशासनानुरोधेन प्रतिष्ठापितपूर्वाः सन्ति, तथा मोहमयीविभागेऽपि राजशासनानुमत्या संस्कृतमहाविद्यालयः प्रतिष्ठापयितव्यः। अत्रार्थशास्त्रराजनीतिशिल्पशास्त्रज्यौतिषसङ्गीतायुपयुक्तविषया अपि पाठ्यक्रमे सन्निवेश्याः। तौलनिकज्ञानसौकर्यार्थं संस्कृतव्यवहारप्रधानेन शास्त्राध्ययनेन साकं तत्र च्छात्राणामाङ्ग्लभाषाया अपि ज्ञानं प्रवेशपरीक्षापर्यन्तं वैकल्पिकं भवतु। शास्त्रनैपुण्योपाधिमधिगत्य वा छात्रैराङ्ग्लभाषाऽध्येतव्या।

२ पाश्चात्यविद्यासम्प्रदायानुसारं प्रतिप्रान्तं प्रतिष्ठापितेषु भारतवर्षीयविश्वविद्यालयेषु पाश्चात्यविद्याविभागेन सार्धं प्रकल्पितो विद्यत प्राच्यविद्याविभागोऽपि (Oriental Faculty) यत्र प्राच्यविद्यानैपुण्यलिप्सुना कृते 'एम्. ओ. एल्.'– परीक्षा शास्त्रिशिरोमण्यादिपरीक्षाश्च तत्तद्विश्वविद्यालयद्वारैव व्यवस्थापिताः । तथा मोहमयीविश्वविद्यालयसमित्यापि प्राच्यविद्याविभाग प्रकल्प्य परीक्षोत्क्रमः कार्यः। अत्र परीक्षाप्रश्नोत्तराणि संस्कृतभाषयैव च्छात्रैर्लेखनीयानीति विधिर्विधेयः । संस्कृतविषये 'पीएच्. डी.' –उपाधिलाभार्थं विरचनीयः प्रबन्धः संस्कृतेनैव लेखनीय इत्यपि नियमो गीर्वाणभाषासमुत्कर्षाय विधातव्यः ।

३ मोहमयीविश्वविद्यालयीयसंस्कृतपरीक्षास्वाङ्ग्लभाषैव मूर्धन्यपदं भजते। प्राच्यविद्याविषये पाश्चात्यैराङ्ग्लभाषया लिखितं वाङ्मयं छात्रैरवश्यमध्येयं, पाश्चात्यानां विचिकित्सापूर्णा गवेषणापद्धतिरपि स्वायत्तीकार्या । किन्तु संस्कृतपरीक्षासु च्छात्रैः प्रश्नपत्रगत पञ्चाशदङ्कपरिमितानां प्रश्नानामुत्तराणि संस्कृतभाषयैव लेखनीयानि, अवशिष्टानि च मातृभाषयाऽऽङ्ग्लभाषया वेति वैकल्पिको विधिर्विधेयः । संस्कृतोपाधिपरीक्षायाः कश्चिदंशो मौखिक एव भवतु वर्गोच्चारसंस्कृतसंलापादिशक्तिपरीक्षार्थम् ।

४ संस्कृतमहाविद्यालयोपाधिधारिणा विदुषा राजशासनद्वारा जीविकोपायाः परिकल्पनीयाश्चेत्थं यथापूर्वं प्रत्याङ्ग्लपाठ्यालयं प्रत्याङ्ग्लमहाविद्यालयं च संस्कृताध्यापकपदे नियोक्तव्याः । अध्यापकपदनियोजनात्पूर्वं संस्कृतपण्डितैरप्यध्यापनमहाविद्यालये वर्षमात्रमध्यापनशास्त्रनैपुण्यं सम्पादनीयमिति नियमो विधेयः । तेषां मासिकी वृत्तिश्चेतरविषयाध्यापकवृत्तेरन्यूना भवतु ।

५ भारतीयसंस्कृतिरक्षणे गीर्वाणवाण्या महत्त्वं समवबुध्य भारतीयनृपैः सम्प्रदायाचार्यैः श्रेष्ठिभिरन्यैर्वा धनैः स्वप्रेरणया प्रतिनगरं संस्कृतपाठशालाः प्रतिष्ठापनीयाः, प्रचलितपूर्वाश्च संरक्षणीयाः । पाठशालाप्रपर्यवेक्षकपदे राजशासनानुरोधेन नियोक्तव्यः प्राच्यप्रतीच्यविद्यानिपुणः पण्डितो यस्याभिमतानुसारेण राज्यशासकैः पाठशालासञ्चालकाः समुचितसाहाय्यधनदानेन परितोषणीयाः । एतासु पाठशालासु प्रायः संस्कृतमहाविद्यालयोपाधिमन्तः शास्त्रपारङ्गता विद्वांसोऽध्यापकपदे नियोक्तव्याः ।

६ आङ्ग्लमहाविद्यालयपाठ्यक्रमे पर्याप्तव्याकरणज्ञानाय पाणि-नीयपरिभाषापरिचयाय च बी. ए. परीक्षापर्यन्तं लघुकौमुद्या मध्यकौमुद्याश्च पठनपाठनयोर्नान्तरीयकत्वं परिगणनीयमिति नूतनो विधिर्मोहमयीविश्व-विद्यालयसमित्या स्वनियमावल्यां समावेश्यः।

७ संस्कृतभाषाप्रसाराय मोहमयीमण्डले तेषु तेषु नगरेषु प्रतिवत्सरं संस्कृतसाहित्यसम्मेलनं सम्पद्यतामिति हेतोः सम्मेलनान्तर्गतविविधकार्यदर्शिका चिरस्थायिनी विद्वत्समितिरेका संस्थाप्या, या नियतशुल्कप्रदानपूर्वकं संस्कृत-प्रणयिभिः सदस्यैः संवर्धनीया। प्रतिनगरं च स्थापनीया गीर्वाणवाग्वर्धिन्य-सभाः याः संस्कृतसाहित्यपरिषत्संस्थया सङ्गच्छन्ताम्।

८ संस्कृतस्य सार्वजनीनप्रचारार्थं संस्कृतानुरागोत्पादनार्थं च चिरस्थायिन्या विद्वत्समित्या हिन्दीप्रचारसंस्थावद् व्युत्पत्तिपरीक्षाक्रमः प्रकल्पनीयः, यस्मिन् सुगमरीत्या प्रौढाप्रौढैः सामान्यजनैरपि वर्षत्रयाभ्यन्तरे संस्कृतभाषायां व्युत्पन्नत्वं सम्पादितं स्यात्।

९ गीर्वाणभाषाप्रचारसौकर्यार्थमाङ्ग्लशब्दस्थाने आधुनिकः विविधव्यवहारोचितानां नूतनसंस्कृतपर्यायाणां निर्माणं नितरामावश्यकम्। तदर्थमेका विद्वत्समितिरधिकर्तव्या, याऽऽधुनिकसंस्कृतसाहित्ये प्रयुक्तपूर्वान् पर्यायान् सङ्कलय्य नूतनसमुचितपर्यायांश्च निर्माय शब्दसूचीं प्रकाशयेत्। एषा सूची प्रान्तीयभाषावैभवसंवर्धनायापि भवेदिति सन्देहातीतमेव।

१० आङ्ग्लदेशीयैराङ्ग्लभाषाया जागतिकप्रसाराय तस्या मौलिक (Basic) स्वरूपं कल्पयित्वा ८५० सङ्ख्याकाः उपयुक्ततमाः शब्दाः सङ्क-लिताः सन्ति। तादृशीमेव रीतिमाश्रित्य कयापि विद्वत्समित्याऽध्ययनसौलभ्याय संस्कृतभाषागतान्युपयुक्ततमानि पदानि परिगणय्य सङ्कलनीयानि। तान्येव पदानि प्रयुज्य बालोपयोगीनि संस्कृतपाठ्यपुस्तकानि विरचयितव्यानि च॥

—:o:—

पद्धतितारतम्यम्।

प्रारम्भिके गीर्वाणभाषाध्यापने हृदयङ्गमत्वमिन्द्रियग्राह्यत्वम् (Con-creteness) आनुपूर्वी (Gradation) परिचितशब्दसङ्ग्रहोऽभिनयवैपुल्यं

छात्रचित्तरञ्जकाश्च विषया इत्येतानि संवादपद्धतितत्त्वान्युपादेयानि। एष संवादपद्धतितत्त्वाश्रय आङ्ग्लभाषाध्यापनपद्धतेरनुकरणमात्रमिति मास्तु कस्याप्यकारणमन्यथाग्रहः। पाश्चात्यानां बालमनोविज्ञानानुसारीणि यान्यनवद्यानि भाषाभ्यासतत्त्वानि तान्येवोपास्यानि संस्कृताध्यापने, न त्वितराणीति वयमत्राभिप्रेमः। यस्य कस्याप्यनवद्यवस्तुनोऽङ्गीकारो न कदापि दोषाय, प्रत्युत हितायैव भवतीति जानन्त्येव सदसद्व्यक्तिहेतवः 'परीक्ष्यान्यतरद्भजमानाः' सन्तः। एषा संवादपद्धतिर्भारतीयैरविदितपूर्वा काचिन्नूतना सरणिरित्यपि न वयं मन्यामहे। भारतीयैरेषा परिपाटी कदाचिदविकलतया नानुसृता स्यात्। किन्तु तस्या मूलरहस्यमाविष्कुर्वद्यस्तनमवतरणं तर्कसङ्ग्रहदीपिकायामुपलभ्यते। यथा—

"शक्तिग्रहश्च वृद्धव्यवहारेण। व्युत्पित्सुर्बालो 'गामानय' इत्युत्तमवृद्धवाक्यश्रवणानन्तरं मध्यमवृद्धस्य प्रवृत्तिमुपलभ्य गवानयनं च दृष्ट्वा मध्यमवृद्धप्रवृत्तिजनकज्ञानस्यान्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां वाक्यजन्यत्वं निश्चित्य 'अश्वमानय' 'गां बधान' इति वाक्यान्तरे आवापोद्वापाभ्यां गोशब्दस्य गोत्वविशिष्टे शक्तिरश्वशब्दस्याश्वत्वविशिष्टे शक्तिरिति व्युत्पद्यते।"

अतः संवादपद्धतिसमाश्रयः केवलं पाश्चात्त्यानुकरणमिति न केनापि मन्तव्यम्। रुचिवैचित्र्याद्विविधाध्यापनपद्धतीरनुसरद्भिः सर्वैरपि शिक्षकैः सततमुद्देश्यं छात्रहितायैव प्रयतितव्यमिति सन्देहातीतमेव। संवादपद्धतिसदृशा ये ये पन्थानश्छात्रहिताय कल्पन्ते ते तेऽखिला अपि शुभा एवेति स्वीकृते मास्तु कोऽपि विवादावसरः। किन्तु तेषु शुभेष्वपि यत्तारतम्यं तद्विवेकार्हं भवति।

अत्र संवादपद्धतिविषयेऽश्रद्दधानाः केचिद्वदन्ति यत्संस्कृताध्यापने संवादपद्धतिसमाश्रयोऽनैपुणिको, यतः संस्कृतभाषाया दैनिकव्यवहारेष्वनुपयुज्यमानत्वान्मृतभाषात्वात् तस्याः प्रकृतिमुपगतं सत्यस्वरूपनिदर्शनं न युक्ताप्यधुनाधिगम्यते। अन्यच्च संस्कृताध्ययने छात्राणां संवादक्षमत्वोत्पादनं नास्ति प्रयोजनं, किन्तु पूर्वतनभारतीयसंस्कृतेः परिचयार्थं ग्रन्थावगाहनपूर्वकमर्थनिर्धारणक्षमताजननमेव प्रमुखं प्रयोजनम्। संवादक्षमत्वनिर्माणकर्मणोऽपांशगमधनत्वे गदनस्य सुकरत्वस्याभावात्संवादपद्धत्यनुसरणं निष्प्रयोजनं

भूरिक्लेशकरमयुक्तमसाध्यं च । पुनश्चाध्यापने यत्संस्कृतं शिक्षकैः प्रयुज्येत तन्न तथा शोभनं संस्कृतं यथा कालिदासबाणादीनां ग्रन्थेषूपलभ्यते। अध्यापने च यत्सम्यग्बोधकरं प्रासङ्गिकविषयावेदनमावश्यकं भवति तदर्थमेकान्ततः क्रियमाणो गीर्वाणवाणीव्यवहारो न किमपि फलमावहेत्। अपि च संवादपद्धत्या गुणावहत्वं यतो निपुणाध्यापकायत्तं ततः संस्कृतसंलापाकुशलैः सामान्यशिक्षकैः सा पद्धतिर्नानुसर्तुं शक्यत इति ।

आदावेवात्र सुविशदं स्पष्टीक्रियते यन्न वयं संवादपद्धतिविषयेऽतिरिक्ताभिमानिनो,नापि च सर्वेषामेव च्छात्राणां संवादक्षमत्वनिर्माणं सुशकमिति मन्यामहे । न च सामान्यच्छात्राणां विषये संलापक्षमत्वोत्पादनमस्मद्धेतुः, अपि तु प्राचीनग्रन्थार्थपरिज्ञानपूर्वकं सम्यग्वाचनक्षमत्वमेवादिमं प्रयोजनमस्मदीयम् । यावान् कालः संस्कृताध्ययनार्थमधुना लभ्यते तावताऽपर्याप्तेन कालेन च्छात्राः संवादपद्धत्या स्वीकृतायामपि न संस्कृतभाषया संवदितुं पारयेयुरित्यनुभवसिद्धं नो मतम् । न पुनः सर्वेऽपि संस्कृतपाठाः संस्कृतभाषयैवाध्यापनीयाः, न वा तेषु मातृभाषोपयोगो न कदापि कार्यं इत्यस्मन्निर्बन्धः । प्रत्युत समग्रमपि व्याकरणमाङ्ग्लभाषासाधनमुज्झित्वा मातृभाषयैवाध्याप्यमानं सम्यग्बोधाय कल्पत इति चिरानुभूतिसिद्धा नो मतिः । वाङ्मयाध्यापनेऽपि दुरूहपदवाक्यादिशोधनाय प्रासङ्गिकविषयावेदनाय व्याकरणविशेषज्ञापनाय च मातृभाषाया एव निष्प्रत्यूहोपयोगोऽस्मद्दृशा प्रशस्ततरो भाति । किन्तु संवादपद्धत्या हेयत्वं सिषाधयिषुभिर्जनैर्यान्याक्षेपवचनान्युदीर्यन्ते तान्यधिकृत्य किञ्चिदत्रोपन्यस्यते ।

आङ्ग्लभाषायाः प्रचारप्राचुर्येण विविधविषयाणां पाठ्यक्रमसन्निवेशेन चानधिगतपर्याप्तावकाशा गीर्वाणभाषा दैनिकव्यवहारेष्वनुपयुज्यमाना सती सम्प्रति तन्निमानं भजत इति सुव्यक्तं पश्यामः । किन्तु सा मृतेति यत्पाश्चात्यविचारमात्रशरणैर्जनैर्मन्यते तत्तु सुतरां वितथम्। पाश्चात्यदेशेषु यथा 'ग्रीक् लॅटिन्' इत्येतादृश्यो भाषाः पञ्चत्वं गतास्तथा च भारतवर्षीयं सुरवाणपीति साधर्म्याभासानुमानेन गीर्वाणवाण्या मृतत्वं सिषाधयिषन्ति केचिद्दूरपरितना जनाः । न तथा सुरसरस्वत्या मृतत्वं स्थापयितुं शक्यते यथा 'ग्रीक् लॅटिन्' इत्येतादृशीनां भाषाणां, यतः सुरभारतीरागरञ्जितं

भारतीयसंस्कृतिरुधिरमद्यापि वहति भारतीयानां धमनीषु । सर्वेषामपि वैदिकधर्मानुयायिनां नित्यनैमित्तिकानि धार्मिककर्माणि संस्कृतभाषयैवाधुनापि विधीयन्ते । धार्मिकव्यवहारेषु प्रयुज्यमानाया एतस्याः संस्कृतभाषायाः सुबोधत्वं कृतिदर्शनपूर्वकमुच्चार्यमाणैर्वाक्यैः सुष्ठु प्रतीयते। दैनिकव्यवहारेष्वपि विविधप्रान्तस्थैर्गीर्वाणभाषापण्डितैरन्योन्यबोधनार्थं संलापग्रन्थविरचनादिषु गीर्वाणवाणीवोपयुज्यमाना दृश्यते। आधुनिकसंस्कृतरत्न च निसर्गमधुरं निदर्शनं संस्कृतनाटकेषु भृशमुपलभ्यते । अपरं च संस्कृतोद्भूतासु विविध-प्रान्तीयभाषासु प्रतिशतं प्रायः पञ्चसप्तत्याकानां शुद्धसंस्कृतशब्दानां सद्भावात्, आधुनिकव्यवहारोचितनूतनशब्दनिर्माणेन प्रान्तीयभाषावैभव-संवर्धने चालङ्कर्मीणत्वान्मातृस्थानीयेयं गीर्वाणवाणी सम्प्रत्यपि जीवन्ती तिष्ठति । इत्थंभूते व्यतिकरे कथं केचिज्जनाः सुरसरस्वत्या मृतत्वं प्रमाणी-कुर्वन्तीति त एव जानन्तु महाभागाः ।

शिक्षकैरध्यापने प्रयुज्यमानं संस्कृतं कालिदासबाणादीनां संस्कृतमिव न शोभनमित्युच्येत चेद्वयमत्र प्रत्युत्तरामो यन्न सर्वेऽपि कालिदासबाणा-दयः । निखिलेऽपि संस्कृतवाङ्मये कालिदासबाणादयोऽङ्गुलिमेया एव नव-नवोन्मेषशालिनः कविप्रवराः । तान् हित्वा पतत्त्रिसञ्चारन्यायेन वैविद्वद्भिः संलापग्रन्थग्रथनादिकर्म कृतं तेषां सर्वोऽपि सदुद्यमो नितान्तं निष्प्रयोजन-स्तेषां ग्रन्थाश्च सर्वथा सुदूरमपास्या इत्युक्तिर्न किञ्चिदपि सामञ्जस्यमर्हति । गैर्वाणी वाणी न केवलमेककविरीतेः किन्तु विविधरीतीनां निदर्शनम् । एतासां विविधरीतीनां सदानुशीलनं शिक्षकभाषायाः शोभनत्वं पुष्णीयात् । अपरं च गीर्वाणवाक्पण्डितानां संलापसरणिं आर्यं भावमपि शिक्षकः स्व-भाषां प्रागल्भ्यकोटिं नेतुं पारयति । गीर्वाणभाषाध्यापकेनैतदनुष्ठानं भूरि-क्लेशकरमशक्यं निष्प्रयोजनं वा मन्येत चेत्स गीर्वाणभाषाध्यापकत्वं कथ-मन्वर्थतया प्रस्थापयति ?। अल्पवेतनतयाजीविकाचिन्तासन्दानितैः सतत-मुदरपूर्तिकर्मव्यापृतत्वाच्चाल्पव्यापारैः सामान्याध्यापकैर्नैतत्कर्म विधातुं शक्यत इत्युच्येत चेद्वयमत्र प्रतिब्रूमो यदुपरितनसंवादसदृशेष्वन्युरग-षु न प्रगाढज्ञानमपेक्ष्यते संस्कृतभाषाया न चापि संवादकुशलत्वं तस्याम् ।

उक्तपूर्वमेवास्माभिरिदं सर्वाचरदविस्तरशनाप्रसादेयतत्त्वे सामान्यच्छात्राणां सम्प्रगर्भप्रदानपूर्वं वाचनश्रवणमननमेवास्मदीयमपि गीर्वाणभाषाध्यापन-

प्रयोजनमिति। किन्तु वाचनाध्यापनात्प्रागध्यापकेनानुसरणीयाः केऽप्यनिवार्याः क्रमाः, यैर्विना वाचनं न सामीचीन्येन कर्तुं शक्येत। सवादपद्धतिविषये केषाचिदन्ययाग्रहोऽस्ति यत्पाठ्यपुस्तकसाहाय्यं विना स्वतन्त्रतयैव च्छात्राध्यापकैः संस्कृतसंवादाः क्रियन्त इति। एतत्तु विपर्यस्तं मतं, यतो बालच्छात्रा न स्वातन्त्र्येण सवदितुं प्रभवन्ति प्रारम्भिके काले। तस्मात्पाठ्यपुस्तकगतपाठानुद्दिश्यैव कानिचन सवादपद्धतितत्त्वान्युपयोक्तव्यान्यध्यापने। तेषां तत्त्वानामनुसरणे हेतुस्त्वयं यदिदानीमाङ्ग्लपाठशालासु प्रतिवर्गं छात्राः प्रायः पञ्चत्रिंशत्सङ्ख्याकाः। बहुविधजातीयत्वात्तेषां वर्णोच्चाराः स्वसंस्कारानुगुणं प्रायो दोषसङ्कुलाः। संस्कृतवर्णोच्चारविषये च समधिकमवधानमपेक्ष्यत इति नैव निवेदनीयम्। अतोऽद्य यावत्प्रगुणा व्याकरणप्रधानानुवादैकपदवी न च्छात्राणां श्रेयसे भवेत्। अनुवादैकपरिपाट्यामनुसृतायां छात्रास्तन्द्रालवोऽनवधानाश्च सम्पद्यन्त इति दरीदृश्यत एव सानुभवैः शिक्षकैः। अनया पद्धत्या बहवोऽध्यापकाः कथनैकपरिपाटीमवलम्ब्य पुस्तकस्थपाठांश्च वाचयित्वा पङ्क्तिशः स्वयमेवानुवादं कुर्वन्ति मातृभाषयाऽऽङ्ग्लभाषया वा, छात्रैश्च केवलमध्यापकोक्तं श्रोतव्यम्। अतश्छात्राणामकिञ्चित्करत्वादेव ते तन्द्रालवः सम्पद्यन्ते। अतश्छात्रवाचनावकाशया चानया पद्धत्या छात्रा न कदापि वाचननैपुण्यमधिगन्तुं प्रभवन्ति। तस्मादियं ग्लानिकरा पद्धतिर्हेया, छात्रसमवधानजनका काप्यन्या पद्धतिरुपादेया चेति सुनिर्णीतम्। येऽध्यापका आत्मनो मन्दौत्सुक्याद् व्याकरणप्रधानामनुवादैकपरिपाटीं सुकरां नैसर्गिकीं च मन्यन्ते त एव सवादपद्धतिं प्रभूतक्लेशकरामनैसर्गिकीं च पश्यन्ति। न ते पुनर्जानन्ति यदध्यापकदृशा या पद्धतिर्नैसर्गिकी सुकरा च सैव च्छात्रदृशा भूरिक्लेशावहा कृत्रिमा च, येन बहवश्छात्राः संस्कृताद्विरज्येतरभाषाध्ययनमवलम्बन्त इति।

अतो बालच्छात्राणां संस्कृताध्ययनं प्रति समुचितप्रवृत्त्यनुरागोत्पादनार्थं सवादपद्धत्या उपरितनानि कानिचित्तत्त्वानि पाठ्यपुस्तकं समाश्रित्यानुसर्तव्यानि। तदनुरोधेन पुस्तकगतपाठस्य साक्षाद्वाचनात्प्राक् तं पाठमुद्दिश्य साभिनयभाषणप्रश्नादिरूपं मौखिकाध्यापनं कार्यमध्यापकेन, तदनु पौर्वापर्येण श्रवणोच्चारणप्रतिवचनरूपो भाषाभ्यासस्तत्त्वानुसारी नैसर्गिकोऽनुक्रमोऽपलक्षणीयश्छात्रैः। अनेनोक्तिप्रत्युक्तिरूपव्यवहारेण च्छात्राः सोत्साहं सावधानं

चाध्याप्यमानविषयाश्रभाजो भवन्ति । पाठगतपदानां सन्दर्भसमन्वयपूर्वकं सहस्रशो व्यक्तिशश्चोच्चैरुच्चावर्तनं, लयस्वरसङ्क्रमविरामादिसमन्वितं सात्त्विकं वैयक्तिकं च वाचनं, संस्कृतप्रश्नद्वारा लब्धानां प्रतिवचनरूपाणां पाठगतवाक्यानां विविधच्छात्रैरर्थपरिग्रहपूर्वकं सुस्पष्टमुच्चारणमित्येव सकलमपि मौखिकमनुष्ठानं छात्राणां वर्णोच्चारशुद्धये, भाषापरिपाकनिष्पत्तये (Assimilation) साधुवाचनाय च कल्पते । अत्र नेत्रसत्कारात्पूर्वं कर्णसंस्कारः, उच्चारणात्पूर्वं श्रवणम्, वाचनात्पूर्वं मौखिकमावर्तनम्, लेखनात्पूर्वं वाचनं चेति भाषाभ्यासतत्त्वस्याऽनुपूर्वी समवधेया । एतन्मौखिकमावर्तनमपि स्वाध्यायपरैर्भारतीयैः सुविदितपूर्वमेव । एतत्तदनुकरणप्रधानं कर्म यस्मिन्बालाः गुरुमनुकुर्वन्ति । गुरुजनव्यवहारानुकरणेनैव भाषाग्रहणं सुलभं भवति, न तु व्याकरणनियमज्ञानेनेति प्रथितं मनोविज्ञानाधिष्ठितं भाषाभ्यासतत्त्वम् ।

अत्र संवादपद्धत्याः कानिचन तत्त्वान्येवाभ्युपगम्यन्ते, न तु साकल्येन संवादपद्धतिः प्रयुज्यत इति सुष्ठु विज्ञातं भवेद्विपश्चिद्भिः । पुस्तकगतपाठमधिकृत्य योऽनुयोगप्रतिवचनरूपो व्यवहारः स एवात्र संवादः । तस्मादस्याः परिपाट्याः 'संवादपद्धतिः' इत्यभिधानात् 'प्रश्नोत्तरपद्धतिः' 'सम्भाषणपद्धतिः' इति वाभिधानं वरम् । उपरिवर्णितक्रमे संवादपद्धतिः (प्रश्नोत्तरपद्धतिः) कथनपद्धतिरनुवादपद्धतिरित्येताः सकला अपि यथाप्रसङ्गं प्रयुज्यन्तेऽध्यापने । तासां सर्वासां योग्यसमन्वयेनैव समीचीनोद्देग भाव्यनेति नो मतम् । तस्मादियं परिपाटी 'सर्वसारग्राहिणी पद्धतिः' (Eclectic Method) इति नाम्नाभिधातव्या । प्रश्नविस्तारादिकं तत्तदुत्तमाभिज्ञ कार्यमित्युक्ते, न तु सर्वेऽप्यध्यापका अस्य कर्मणः, यद्वा दक्षा एव चेद्यदनुभूतिमधिष्ठाय प्रवृत्तो पठनाभ्यासनयेनैतदनुष्ठानमिति । सटीकसंस्कृतग्रन्थानामसकृद्वाचनेन शिक्षको भाषानैपुण्यमधिगम्याध्यापनकर्माणि स्वोपादकं विधातुं प्रभवेदिति बलीयान्नो विश्वासः । प्रौढच्छात्राध्यापने पूर्वतनपण्डितैरनुसृता मल्लिनाथादिटीकाकृतामपि विहितपद्धतिरीत्यपरिवर्तितानुविधेया । परिवर्तनं त्वेतदत्र यदनेकवारिपाटी विहाय संस्कृतटीकाकृता पद्धत्या समयमनुयोगप्रतिवचनानुष्ठानरूपो नूतनः प्रकारः समवल-

स्वनीयः। संस्कृतमाश्रित्य वक्तव्यमिति यद्यप्युक्तमत्र तथापि नैव सार्वत्रिको विधिः। यथाप्रसङ्गं मातृभाषापि विवरणार्थमुपयोज्येत्युक्तपूर्वमेव।

अध्यापनपटुत्वोपपदधारिभिः शिक्षकैरुपरिसूचितपद्धत्यनुसारिभिर्भाव्यमिति सुतरामाशास्यते। केचित्पद्धतिपटवोऽपि शिक्षका वदन्ति यद् "अध्यापनमहाविद्यालयेऽनुसृता पद्धतिरस्माभिः स्वकीयपाठशालासु नानुसर्तुं शक्यते। यत्रास्माकं प्रतिदिनं पञ्चषड्होरात्मकः कालोऽध्यापनकर्मणि व्यतीतो भवति, तत्र प्रतिपाठं टिप्पणीलेखनार्थमस्माभिः कथमवसरो लब्धव्यः। एतद्भूरिक्लेशवशात्कथमस्माभिः प्रतिदिनमविरतोत्साहैर्भवितव्यम्" इति। एषोक्तिर्नानुपपन्ना। किन्तु वयमेतद्वक्तुकामा यदध्यापनमहाविद्यालयगता पद्धतिः सततास्याभ्यासवशादध्यापकबुद्धौ सुस्थिरा सती प्रकृतिभावमापद्यते। इत्थंभूते पाठटिप्पणीलेखनप्रयोजनं नावशिष्टं भवति। उपपदलाभानन्तरं शिक्षका न केवलमध्यापनमहाविद्यालयस्था गीर्वाणभाषाध्यापनपद्धतिमेव परित्यजन्ति, अपि त्वितरविषयाध्यापनपद्धतीरपीति सर्वजनविदिता परिस्थितिः। पद्धतिपटुरध्यापकोऽमन्दोत्साहश्छात्रहितनिरतश्चेत्स पाठटिप्पणीलेखनं विनापि स्वीयेनाध्यापनकर्मणा सर्वदैव च्छात्रचेतःसु पाठ्यविषये रतिं जनयेदित्यत्र नास्ति विवादावकाशः। अध्यापकः पुनर्मन्दोत्साहश्छात्रहितानवहितश्चेत्तदाध्यापनपटुत्वोपपदधारिणापि तेन न किमपि रुचिरं क्रियेत।

अपरं च पद्धतिपटवः शिक्षका अन्यूनत्वेन इत उत्तरमुपलभ्येरन्, यतः केवलं मोहमयीविभागे एवाधुना चत्वारोऽध्यापनमहाविद्यालयाः प्रतिष्ठापिताः सन्ति। एतेभ्यः प्रतिवत्सरं ये कृतविद्या भूत्वा बहिर्गच्छन्ति तेषु केचन लघुपत्तनस्थपाठशालास्वपि शिक्षकपदे नियुज्यन्ते। अतः पद्धतिपटुशिक्षकवैरल्यशङ्का न पदं लभते। विधिस्त्वयं कार्यो यत्पद्धतिपटुभिः शिक्षकैरध्यापनमहाविद्यालयगतपद्धते रुचिरत्वं समवबुध्य साऽव्यभिचारेण मनसा स्वशालास्वनुसरणीया।

अनासादिताध्यापननैपुण्यैः सामान्यशिक्षकैरुपरिदर्शिता पद्धतिर्नानुसर्तुं शक्यत इत्यस्य पूर्वपक्षस्य प्रत्युत्तरमेतद्यत्सामान्यशिक्षकैरनुवादपद्धतिरनुविधेया। तथाप्यनिपुणैरिव निपुणैरपि शिक्षकैरेवानुवादपद्धतिरेकान्ततः

समाश्रयणीया, सा चैव नैसर्गिकीति चेत्तस्यापि दुराग्रहस्तर्हि तद्दृष्ट्या सर्वेऽप्यध्यापनमहाविद्यालया निष्प्रयोजनास्तेषु च शिक्षकाणामध्यापननैपुण्य-सम्पादनोद्यमो निरर्थकश्च । एषा स्वविमृश्यकारिणामेव दृष्टिरित्यतो न सा मनागपि मनोयोगमर्हति । अनुवादपद्धतिस्तु नास्मद्दृष्ट्या तथा दोषदूषिता यथा संवादपद्धतिविषयेऽतिरिक्ताभिमानिभिर्गण्यते । व्याकरणप्रधानाया विश्लिष्टवाक्यानुवादपद्धतेः संश्लिष्टपरिच्छेदानुवादपद्धतिर्वरमिति नो मतम् । अतः संश्लिष्टपरिच्छेदसमन्वितानि समीचीनानि संस्कृतपाठ्यपुस्तकान्यपेक्ष्यन्त इत्यपि नो भाति । सामान्यशिक्षकाणामनुवादपद्धतिसमाश्रयणं न दोषावहं, किन्तु तैर्यत्स्वयमेव वाचनपूर्वकमनुवादः क्रियते, छात्रैश्च केवलं श्रूयते तदनिष्टम् । सामान्यशिक्षकैर्वाक्याध्यापनमधस्तनरीत्या कार्यम्—

प्रथमं तैः समुचितप्रस्तावानन्तरं मातृभाषया पाठसारं कथयित्वा-ध्याप्यमानः समग्रपाठः पाठांशो वा सन्धिविश्लेषणपूर्वकं सुस्पष्टं सद्वा-चनीयः । तदनु शिक्षकेण छात्रैः साकं स एव पाठांशो सद्यशो वाचनीयः । अनन्तरं छात्रैस्तस्यैव पाठांशस्य मनोगतवाचनं कार्यम् । मनोगतवाचन-समये शिक्षकेण कठिनपदार्थबोधने साहाय्यकारिणा भाव्यम् । छात्रैर-परिचितपदज्ञानानन्तरं स्वयमेव पाठार्थनिर्धारणे प्रयतितव्यमिति मनोगत-वाचनप्रयोजनम् । अवसिते मनोगतवाचने प्रत्येकं छात्रेण वाक्यानि यथार्ह-मुच्चार्य वाचयित्वाऽनुवादप्रयत्नो विधेयः । अत्रापि शिक्षकेण छात्राणां क्लिष्ट-पदप्रतिबोधन एव साहाय्यं कर्तव्यं, न त्वन्यथा । अनुवादे छात्रसंविभाग एव समधिको भवतु, येन सर्वेऽपि शिष्याः सावधानाः स्थास्यन्ति । अनु-वादमनु कैश्चिच्छात्रैः समग्रपाठांशः सुस्वरं वाचनीयो येन सर्वेषामपि वाचः शुद्धिर्भवेत्, सर्वे च वाचननिपुणाः सम्पद्येरन् । छात्रवाचनार्थं माध्यमिकपाठशालासु न कदाप्यवकाशो दीयत इत्यसमञ्जसमेव । इयं वाक्याध्यापनरीतिः सामान्यशिक्षकैरप्यनुसर्तुं शक्या स्यादिति भाति । अन्यच्च वाक्यपरिचयपूर्वकमेव व्याकरणमध्याप्यमिति पद्धत्यन्तरगतत्त्वं यद्यपि सामान्यशिक्षकैर्व्यवहारतः नेतुं शक्येत ॥

—•—

वाङ्मयाध्यापनरीतिः।

वाङ्मयाध्यापने विश्लिष्टानि (त्रुटितानि) वाक्यान्युपक्रमावस्थायां नाध्यापनीयानि। यतस्त्रुटितवाक्येषु नैकाकिनमेव विषयं वस्तु वा पुरस्कृत्य सम्बद्धं वर्णनं कथनं वा क्रियते, येन च्छात्रचित्तानुरञ्जनं सम्पद्येत। अपि च त्रुटितवाक्यद्वारा व्याकरणमेवाध्याप्यते, न तु वाङ्मयं, व्याकरणाध्ययनार्थमेव त्रुटितवाक्यान्युदाह्रियन्त इति च्छात्रहृदयस्थः संस्कारः प्रमार्ष्टुं न शक्यते। अयं संस्कार उपक्रमावस्थायां 'संस्कृतभाषाध्ययनं क्लेशकरम्' इत्युद्वेगमुत्पादयति। अत उपक्रमपाठ्यपुस्तकेषु प्रतिपाठं विषयैकमधिकृत्य सुगमदुर्गमक्रमेण लेखनीयाः सङ्कलनीया वा कथासंवादवर्णनकाव्यात्मकाः संश्लिष्टपरिच्छेदाः, येषूत्तरोत्तरं गीर्वाणभाषागता विविधवाक्यभेदा विविधभावभेदाश्च सम्यगुपदर्शिता भवेयुः। विषयाः पुनर्शातपूर्वाश्छात्रमनोविनोदकाः प्राच्यसंस्कृतिबोधकाश्च स्युः। यथा—शरीरावयवाः, परिचितक्रियाः, परिचितवस्तूनि, परिचितप्राणिनः, परिचितदृश्यानि च। शरीरावयवानां परिचितक्रियासु वचनप्रतिवचनपूर्वं प्रदर्शितासु प्रारम्भ उपयुक्ततिङन्तानां पाठनं सुकरं भवति।

"वाङ्मयाध्यापने प्रायः कः कल्पोऽनुसर्तव्योऽध्यापकेन, कया दृष्टया च" इत्यन्यतमः प्रश्नो विद्यते मम संस्कृताध्यापनप्रश्नावल्या, यस्य प्रत्युत्तरं कांश्चित्केन लब्धं मयाद्य यावत्। विरला एव ते जना ये साङ्गुलिनिर्देशं साक्षाद्वाङ्मयाध्यापनरीतिं वर्णयितुं पारयन्ति। अतः सम्यगवधारणार्थं मनोविज्ञानाधिष्ठितभाषातत्त्वावलम्बिनी प्राच्यसम्प्रदायानपायिनी च वाङ्मयाध्यापनरीतिः समासतोऽत्रोपस्थाप्यते।

१ प्रस्तावः [पदपरिचयः]—प्रस्तावे ज्ञातविषयेण समममज्ञातविषयः कुतूहलजननपूर्वकं संयुज्यते। विषये ज्ञातपूर्वे सत्यप्यधीयमाना भाषाऽभाऽज्ञाता, यस्या ज्ञानमधिगन्तव्यम्। अत एवाऽऽदावध्याप्यमानपाठगतानामपरिचितपदानां परिचयो वस्तुचित्राभिनयादिदर्शनपूर्वकं सन्दर्भसमन्वयपुरस्सरं चाध्यापकेन कार्यः। प्रथममध्यापकेन प्रत्यक्षं वस्तु चित्रं वा प्रदर्श्य, तद्वाचकं पाठगतपदं समकालमेव सुस्पष्टमभिधाय, पदं फलके

स्थूलाक्षरैर्विलिख्य च तस्य परिस्फुटमुच्चारण द्विस्त्रिर्वा छात्रमुखैः कारयितव्यम्। शब्दार्थज्ञापने विविधाः क्रियाः शरीरावयवैर्विधाय चित्रादिदर्शनद्वारा वस्तुसंस्थानगुणधर्मादिकं वर्णनीयं मुखेन। भाषाया घटकावयवो वाक्य, न तु पदमित्यन्विताभिधानवादिना मतानुसारेणापरिचितपदानि वाक्यैपृथ्युच्चैर्वाध्याप्यानि, न तु विश्लिष्टत्वेन पाठनीयानि। यतः पदज्ञापने वृद्धव्यवहारस्य श्रेयस्त्वमभिमन्वाना अन्विताभिधानवादिनो वाक्यस्य सङ्गतार्थग्रहणेनैव बालाना सम्यग्बोधो भवति, न पदमात्रश्रवणेनेति वदन्ति। तेषा रीतिमनुसृत्य भाषाया व्यवहार एव कार्यो मौखिकाध्यापने। विशेषतश्च बालच्छात्रैः सङ्गतवाक्यश्रवणपूर्वकमेव पदान्यभ्यसनीयानि। यथा—

एष. वृक्षः (अस्ति)। एषा वृक्षस्य शाखा (अस्ति)। शाखायाम् एषः खगः। वृक्षे एतत् फलम्। फल वर्णेन पीतम् (वर्णोऽत्र प्रत्यक्ष प्रदर्शनीयः)। खगः एतत् फल भक्षयति (अभिनयदर्शनम्)। एवम् "गच्छ–आगच्छ, उत्तिष्ठ–उपविश, वाचय, वद" इति क्रियापदान्यभिनयद्वारैव पाठ्यन्ते।

एतत्सर्वं गीर्वाणभाषयैव वक्तव्यम्। अनया रीत्या छात्रा मातृभाषोपयोग विनापि पाठगतानपरिचितशब्दार्थान् सन्दर्भमात्रेण ज्ञातु पारयन्ति। अत्र च्छात्रज्ञानेन्द्रियेषु प्राधान्येन त्रिविध. संस्कारो भवति, यथा–शब्दश्रवणे श्रुतिसंस्कारः, शब्दोच्चारणे वाक्संस्कारः, चित्रवर्णाभिनयादेर्लिखितशब्दस्य चावलोकने चक्षु संस्कारश्च। शब्दाना कण्ठस्थीकरणेऽय त्रिविधः संस्कारः स्मृतिविकासचर्योत्पादनेनातीवोपकारको भवति। अध्यापकेन फलके लिखिता नूतनशब्दाश्छात्रैः स्वटिप्पणीपुस्तिकासु प्रतिलेख्याः। अत्र बोधपुरस्सरनिर्दोषलेखनार्थं छात्रहस्तेऽपि संस्कारः कार्यः। अपरिचितभाषाध्यापने पाश्चात्यभाषातत्त्वविदां मतानुसारेण शब्दार्थज्ञापन प्रायः (१) उपरितनरीत्या प्रत्यक्षदर्शनेन (व्यवहारेण), (२) मातृभाषानुवादेन, (३) लक्षणपर्यायादिकथनेन, (४) वाक्यगतसन्दर्भेण चेति चतुर्धा विधीयते। अत्रोत्तरोत्तरस्मात्पूर्वपूर्वः प्रकारः श्रेयान्, किन्तु बालाध्यापने प्रथम एव श्रेष्ठः।

पदपरिचयसमये शिक्षकेण च्छात्रैः पदाना सादृश्यमावर्तनं द्विस्त्रिर्वा कारयित्वा स्पष्टतः शब्दोच्चारण कारयितव्य छात्रमुखैः। एत-

दसकृदावर्तनं वैदिकानां वेदपठनावर्तनस्य सुतरां सादृश्यं वहति, अग्रे च च्छात्राणां सच्छुद्धोच्चारणाय साधुवाचनाय च कल्पते। साङ्घिकावर्तने छात्रा अन्यच्छात्रसमागमेन स्वोच्चारणस्य युक्तायुक्तत्वं परीक्षितुं शक्नुवन्ति, विश्रम्भं च लभन्ते। अतः साङ्घिकावर्तनं वैयक्तिकोच्चारणात्पूर्वं कारयितव्यमध्यापकेनेति भाषाभ्यासतत्त्वम्। साङ्घिकावर्तने प्रथममध्यापकः सुविशदं शब्दमभिदधाति, तमनु च सर्वे छात्रा यौगपद्येन तमेव शब्दं वदन्ति। एतद् वृद्धव्यवहारानुकरणरूपं कर्म प्रतिसमयं द्विस्त्रिर्वा विधीयते।

२ वाचनम्। यं विषयमुद्दिश्य शब्दपरिचयावर्तनादिरूपं मौखिकमनुष्ठानं कृतं स एव विषयः पाठ्यपुस्तके लिखितरूपेण वर्तत इति निर्दिष्टं पाठ्यमानविभागो वाच्यतेऽधुना। अत्र वाचनात्पूर्वं मौखिकावर्तनं, लेखनात्पूर्वं वाचनं चेति भाषाभ्यासतत्त्वानुसारि पौर्वापर्यं समवधेयम्। अतोऽवसिते शब्दपरिचयादौ शिक्षको यथाप्रसङ्गं व्यक्तवर्णोच्चारलय–काकु–विरामादीनि सम्यग्वाचनतत्त्वान्याश्रित्य स्वयमेवोच्चैः समग्रमध्याप्यमानपाठं वाचयति। कदाचित्स सङ्घशश्छात्रैः सार्धं वा वाचयति। साङ्घिके वाचने तु शिक्षक उपरिदर्शितपद्धत्या पूर्वमेकैकं वाक्यं वाचयति, पश्चाच्च च्छात्राः सङ्घशः शिक्षकमनु तत्तदेव वाक्यं वाचयन्ति। पाठगतभावानुगुणलघुगुरूच्चारण–लय–काकु–विरामादियोजनेनैव समग्रपाठार्थो मातृभाषानुवादं विनापि च्छात्रैः सामान्यतोऽवगन्तुं शक्यते। सम्यग्वाचनमेवार्थावगमस्य गमकमित्यवबुद्ध्याध्यापकेन दृढानुशीलनपूर्वकं वाचननैपुण्यं सम्पादनीयम्। केचिद्विश्वविद्यालयोपाधिधारिणोऽप्यध्यापका गद्यपद्यात्मकान् संस्कृतपरिच्छेदान् समीचीनतया वाचयितुं नेशते, किमुत च्छात्राः। अत एव सनिर्बन्धमभिधीयते यत् प्राचीनसम्प्रदायिनां शास्त्रिप्रवराणां परिहासं परित्यज्याऽऽङ्ग्लोपाधिधारिभिर्गीर्वाणभाषाध्यापकैस्तेषां सुमनोहरा वाचनपद्धतिरनुकर्तव्येति।

३ वाचितभागमधिकृत्य प्रश्नाः। अनन्तरं पाठसन्दर्भानुसारेण शब्दार्थयोः समुचितसाहचर्यं छात्रमनःसु सुस्थिरं भवतु, वाक्यगतान्योन्यपदकारकज्ञानेन समग्रपाठः सुविशदार्थो भवतु चेति हेतोः पाठमुद्दिश्याध्यापकेन यथाक्रमं खण्डान्वयपद्धत्या प्रश्नानुष्ठानं कार्यम्। श्रुतार्थग्रहण-

सौकर्याय यथाऽन्विताभिधानवादिनां मतमनुसरणीयं तथा लिखितार्थ-ग्रहणसौकर्याय पदबोधपुरस्सरं वाक्यगतान्योन्यपदान्वयमवगच्छतामभिहि-तान्वयवादिनां मतमप्यत्र ग्राह्यम् । इत्थमभिहितान्वयान्विताभिधान-योः समुच्चय एव वाञ्छनः। सुखबोधाय श्रुतलिखितभाषाध्यापने कार्यः । लिखि-तभाषागतवाक्यबोधाय वाक्यस्यान्योन्यपदानां साकाङ्क्षत्वमन्वयश्च युगपद् बोद्धव्यम् । अत एव वाक्यस्यपदानां खण्डशोऽन्वयः प्रश्नोत्तररीत्या क्रियते । इयं खण्डान्वयपद्धतिराकाङ्क्षायोग्यतासंनिधितत्त्वं पुरस्कृत्य प्राचीनभारतीयदार्शनिकैरेव समुद्भाविता, विस्तरेण चानुसृता काश्मीरक-वल्लभदेवविरचितायां शिशुपालवधटीकायां नारायणविरचितायां नैषधकाव्य-टीकायां च । मल्लिनाथकृताः पञ्चमहाकाव्यटीका दण्डान्वयपद्धत्यवलम्बिन्यः। दण्डान्वयात् खण्डान्वयो बालबुद्धिबोधनविषये प्रशस्यतरः, पाश्चा-त्यानां संवादपद्धतिरिवानुयोगप्रतिवचनात्मकः प्रकारो भाषाया दृढानुशीलनार्थमतीवोपयुक्तश्च । अतोऽयं टीकाग्रन्थनिविष्टः प्रश्नोत्तररूपः खण्डान्वयो मौखिकाध्यापनेऽध्यापकैर्विस्तरेणोपयो-जनीय इत्यस्मदभिप्रायः । खण्डान्वयपद्धत्या प्रधानवाक्यगतं क्रियापदं पुरस्कृत्यैव कर्तृकर्मपदानि विशेषणाद्यवशिष्टपदानि च प्रश्नद्वारा निष्का-स्यन्ते, सुबोधपर्यायैश्च व्याख्यायन्ते । अनेनैव क्रमेण समुचितप्रश्न-विधानपूर्वकमध्यापकैश्छात्रेभ्यः पुस्तकपाठगतपदान्याश्रित्य प्रत्युत्तराणि खण्डशो लब्धव्यानि । अध्यापकेन प्रश्नाः सर्वानेव च्छात्रानुद्दिश्य प्रष्टव्याः, न तु विशिष्टमेव च्छात्रमुद्दिश्य, येन सर्वेऽप्यवहिताः स्यास्यन्ति । अत्र च्छात्रैर्देयानि प्रतिवचनानि सम्पूर्णवाक्यरूपाण्येवापेक्षणी-यानि । यस्मिन्कस्मिन्नपि लघुपरिमाणे परिच्छेदे बहवः प्रश्नाः सम्भवन्ति । अतः परिच्छेदबोधनार्थमस्खलितोच्चारणार्थं च प्रारम्भिकाध्यापने प्रश्न-विधानप्राचुर्यमवलम्बनीयमध्यापकेन । प्राथमिकावस्थायां यावच्छक्यं पाठ-गतपदान्युपस्पृश्यैव प्रश्ना विरचनीयाः, येन च्छात्राः प्रायः पुस्तकपदान्ये-वोपयुज्य प्रत्युत्तराणि दातुं प्रभवन्ति । उत्तरावस्थायामनया पद्धत्या पाठ्यमानपरिच्छेदो मातृभाषोपयोगं विनापि सम्यगवगतार्थो भवति । प्रारम्भे छात्राः प्रश्नकाले पुस्तकमुद्घाट्यैव प्रतिभाषन्ताम्, पश्चाच्च प्रत्युत्तर-समये तेषां पुस्तकानि पिहितानि तिष्ठन्तु । एतत्प्रश्नोत्तरविधानं सुकरत्व-

बदप्रबोधभूयिष्ठमिति न केनापि मन्तव्यम्, यतश्छात्रैः प्रबोधपूर्वकं "किं प्रश्नस्वरूपं, को विषयः प्रत्युत्तरे समावेश्यः, कथं च प्रत्युत्तरे पदवाक्यादिविन्यासः कार्यः" इति निपुणं विमृश्यैव प्रत्युत्तरं देयम्। एवं याते कियत्यपि काले प्रश्नप्रतिवचनानुष्ठानस्थितं पुस्तकगतभाषानुसरणं छात्रबोधानुसारेण शनैः शनैः परित्यक्तव्यम्। यस्मिन्कस्मिन्नपि वाक्ये कर्तृकर्मक्रियाविशेषणाव्ययवाचकाः प्रश्ना यथाशक्यं सम्भवन्ति। ते च किंकथम्भूतादीनि पदानि प्रयुज्य विरचनीयाः। यथा बालाध्यापनेऽस्तनो गणेशवर्णनपरः प्रारम्भपाठो गृहीतः स्याच्चेत्तस्याध्यापनमधोलिखितरीत्या कार्यम्।

ॐ नमः श्रीगणेशाय।

"गणेशः गणानाम् ईशः। गणेशस्य पिता शिवः माता च गौरी। गणेशस्य मस्तकं सिन्दूरेण आरक्तम्। तस्मात् मस्तकात् सुगन्धिः मदः स्रवति। अतः एव लुब्धाः भ्रमराः तद् मस्तकं परितः भ्रमन्ति। गणेशः कर्णौ इतस्ततः चालयति भ्रमरान् च अपसारयति। गणेशस्य मस्तकं रत्नयुतेन किरीटेन चन्द्रस्य कलया च भूषितम्।

"तस्य द्वौ वामौ द्वौ दक्षिणौ च इति चत्वारः हस्ताः सन्ति। ते हस्ताः सुवर्णस्य वलयैः भूषिताः। गणेशः एकेन हस्तेन अङ्कुशं, द्वितीयेन कमलं, तृतीयेन च मोदकं वहति। चतुर्थं हस्तं सः अग्रे प्रसारयति, तेन च सः भक्तेभ्यः वरं यच्छति, 'सर्वेषां मङ्गलं भवतु' इति॥"

अस्मिन् प्रारम्भपाठे विसन्धिलेखनमनुसृत्य मातृभाषायां प्रचुरतयोपयुज्यमाना एव शब्दा बुद्ध्या प्रयुक्ताः। तेषां शब्दानां वाक्यगतसंस्कृतरूपपरिज्ञानमेवात्र प्रमुखं प्रयोजनम्। परमत्र "आरक्त, परितः, इतस्ततः, वाम-दक्षिण, वलयम्" इति पदानि, "स्रवति, भ्रमन्ति, चालयति, अपसारयति, प्रसारयति, वहति, यच्छति" इति प्रत्यक्षक्रियावाचकानि पदानि च छात्राणामपरिचितानि। एतान्यपरिचितपदानि वस्तुचित्रादिप्रदर्शनेन शरीराभिनयदर्शनेन च पाठारम्भे कथितपूर्वेण साङ्घिकावर्तनादिना क्रमशो ज्ञापयितुं शक्यन्ते। ततः परिच्छेदस्याध्यापककृतात्प्रकटवाचनादनन्तरमधस्तनरीत्या प्रश्नप्रतिवचनरूपो व्यवहारः प्रचालनीयः। प्रश्नानुष्ठानेऽप्यत्र चित्राद्युपयोगः कार्यः। छात्राणामपेक्षितोत्तराणि शिक्षकस्य

विशेषविधानं चार्धचन्द्रचिह्नद्वयेस्थापितानि । यद्यपि प्रत्युत्तराण्यत्र लेखन-सङ्क्षेपार्थं न सम्पूर्णतया लिखितानि, तथापि तानि च्छात्रेभ्यः सम्पूर्ण-वाक्यरूपेणैव निष्कासनीयानि ।

प्रश्नोत्तराणि विवरणं च । (चित्रमुद्दिश्य) कः एषः ? (एषः गणेशः) । एषः केषाम् ईशः ? (एषः गणानाम् ईशः ।–अत्र 'गण'–शब्दमुद्दिश्य मातृभाषायामध्यापकेन किमपि कथनीयम्)। कः गणेशस्य पिता ? (शिवः)। का च माता ? (गौरी) ।–पार्वतीत्यप्यभिधानमध्यापकेन कथनीयम् । अत्र गणेशः पार्वतीपरमेश्वरयोः पुत्रत्वं कथं प्राप्त इति पौराणिकः सन्दर्भो मातृभाषया समासतः कथनीयः । अनन्तरमारक्तो वर्णश्छात्रेभ्यो दर्शयितव्यः । तदनन्तरं प्रश्नः) । गणेशस्य मस्तकं केन आरक्तम् ? (सिन्दूरेण) । मदः स्रवति, कस्मात् ? (तस्मात् मस्तकात्) । कीदृशः मदः स्रवति ? (सुगन्धिः) । भ्रमराः भ्रमन्ति, कुत्र ? (तद् मस्तकं परितः ।–'परितः' इत्यत्र क्रियाभिनयः कार्यः) । कथम्भूताः भ्रमराः ? (लुब्धाः) । भ्रमराः लुब्धाः, कुतः ? ('मस्तकात् सुगन्धिः मदः स्रवति, अतः एव' इति सम्पूर्णं कारणनिर्देशकरं वाक्यं पुनश्छात्रैरुच्चारणीयम्) । गणेशः कर्णौ चालयति, कथम् ? (इतस्ततः ।–अभिनयदर्शनम्) । गणेशः अन्यच्च किं करोति ? (अपसारयति ।–अभिनयदर्शनम्) । सः कान् अपसारयति ? (भ्रमरान्) । गणेशस्य मस्तकं भूषितं, केन ? (किरीटेन) । किंविशिष्टेन किरीटेन भूषितम् ? (रत्नयुतेन ।–'रत्नैः युतेन युक्तेन सहितेन' इति विग्रहपुरःसरं सुबोधपर्यायः कथनीयः) । पुनश्च तद् मस्तकं भूषितं, कया ? (चन्द्रस्य कलया । चन्द्रकलाया आकारस्य रुचिरत्वं, किरणानां सुखशीतलत्वं चोद्दिश्य च्छात्राणां परिचितानुभवो मातृभाषया छात्रेभ्यः प्रश्नपूर्वकं निष्कासनीयः) । गणेशस्य कति हस्ताः सन्ति ? (चत्वारः । छात्रैश्च 'एकः द्वौ त्रयः चत्वारः' इति रीत्या हस्ताः गणनीयाः) । चत्वारः हस्ताः कथं तिष्ठन्ति ? (द्वौ वामौ द्वौ दक्षिणौ च इति) । हस्ताः भूषिताः, कैः ? (सुवर्णस्य वलयैः ।–चित्रे छात्रैर्वलयानि प्रदर्शयितव्यानि) । (चित्रमुद्दिश्य) गणेशः एकेन हस्तेन वहति, कम् ? (अङ्कुशम्) । सः कमलं वहति, केन

हस्तेन ? (द्वितीयेन हस्तेन)। सः मोदकं वहति, केन हस्तेन ? (तृतीयेन)। सः अग्रे प्रसारयति (अभिनयदर्शनम्) कम् ? (चतुर्थं हस्तम्)। तेन सः किं करोति ? (वरं यच्छति)। स वरं यच्छति (अभिनयदर्शनम्) केभ्यः। (भक्तेभ्यः)। कः सः वरः ? ('सर्वेषां *मङ्गलं भवतु' इति।—अन्तिम समग्र वाक्य छात्रैर्मातृभाषायामनुवदि*तव्यम्। इत्थं विशिष्टवाक्यानां दुर्बोधवाक्यानां च मातृभाषयानुवादश्छात्रावबोधपरीक्षार्थं *मध्ये मध्ये समाश्रयणीयः*)।

स्थालीपुलाकन्यायेन बालाध्यापने खण्डान्वयपद्धतेरुपयोजनमुपरि दर्शितम्। *अत्राध्यापकेन न केवलं प्रश्नाः प्रष्टव्याः, अपि तु वाक्यगतदुरूह*पदसहतीनां सरलसुबोधसंस्कृतेनैव यावच्छक्यमर्थो विशदीकर्तव्यः। खण्डान्वयावलम्बिटीकाकृतामर्थविवृतौ यथा समासविग्रहः सुबोधपर्यायकथनममरादिकोशपङ्क्तिप्रस्तावो वाग्विशेषविवरणं तात्पर्यकथनं पौराणिकसन्दर्भकथनमित्यादयो विविधप्रकारा उपयुज्यन्ते तथैव क्रमोऽध्यापकेन मौखिकाध्यापने समवलम्बनीयः। अनया परिपाट्या वाक्यस्थान्योन्यपदानां कारकमर्थश्च सम्यक्तया छात्रैरवगम्येते। केषाञ्चिद्वाक्यरचनाविशेषाणां स्थूणानिखननन्यायेन दृढीकरणाय तत्तद्रचनाविशिष्टानि वाक्यान्तराण्युदाहृत्य तत्सदृशानां मातृभाषास्थवाक्यानां संस्कृतेऽनुवादश्छात्रैः कारयितव्यः। कदाचिदनेकवाक्यतात्पर्यबोधका एकवाक्यतासूचका व्यापकप्रश्ना विशेषतश्छात्राणां प्रौढावस्थायां प्रष्टव्याः। प्रौढच्छात्राणां *पञ्चमहाकाव्याध्यापनेऽपीयमेव रीतिः प्रश्नपरिमाणं लघूकृत्य खण्डान्वयिटीका*ग्रन्थानुसारेणोपयोज्या। अध्यापकेन प्रश्नाश्छात्रदृष्टिमग्रे निधाय सोल्लासं सकौशलं च प्रष्टव्याः। अध्यापने सर्वदैवाध्यापकमनोवृत्त्या तथा सोल्लासया भाव्यं, यथा सैव च्छात्रेष्वपि सङ्क्रम्य तेषामध्याप्यविषये कुतूहलमनुरागं चोत्पादयेत्। यद्यप्यध्यापने प्रश्नप्रतिवचनार्थविवृतिकर्मणि संस्कृतमेव प्रयोक्तव्यं, तथापि वाग्विशेषज्ञापनार्थं पौराणिकसन्दर्भकथनार्थं परिचितानुभवनिवेदनार्थं दुरूहकल्पनाविशदीकरणार्थं च मातृभाषापि प्रसङ्गवशेन च्छात्रबोधसौकर्याय प्रयोज्या। प्रश्ना वैविध्यपूर्णाः सुतर्कानुसारिणश्चापेक्ष्यन्ते। समुचितप्रत्युत्तराणि कैश्चिच्छात्रैः क्रमशः पुनरुच्चारणीयानि।

एवं वैयक्तिकवाक्यानां पर्याप्तं मौखिकावर्तनं भाषासंस्कारदृढत्वाय समग्रपरिच्छेदस्य साधुवाचनाय च कल्पते।

४ पुनर्वाचनम्। प्रश्नोत्तरसङ्कलितेऽर्थविशदीकरणे समाप्तेऽधिगतज्ञानस्य सङ्कलनाय च्छात्रचेतःसु स्थिरीकरणाय चाध्यापकेन पुनर्यथापूर्वमेवाधीतभागो वाचनीयः। आवश्यकं चेदध्यापकेन च्छात्रैः साकं पुनरपि साङ्घिकवाचनं कार्यम्। तदनन्तरं प्रत्येकं छात्रेण सकलाध्येतॄणां पुरत आगत्य समधीतपाठांशः सुस्पष्टं वाचनीयः। अत्रान्यच्छात्रैर्वाचनप्रमादपरिमार्जनं कर्तव्यं साधूच्चारणाभ्यासाय। पाठस्य मुहुर्मुहुरुच्चैर्वाचनं यावन्मात्रं विद्यार्थिभिः क्रियेत तावन्मात्रं तैर्भावार्थावबोधपूर्वं स्वायत्तीकृता स्यात्। अपि च गीर्वाणवाण्याः श्रुतिसुखदं पदलालित्यमर्थगौरवं व्यञ्जकत्वं च तदैव प्रतीयन्ते यदाऽस्खलितव्यक्तवर्णोच्चारयुतं प्रोच्चैर्वाचनमारभ्यते। अतश्छात्रैर्मुक्तकण्ठवाचनाभ्यासो यथाक्रमं परिवर्धितव्य इत्यत्र विषये सविशेषोद्यमोऽध्यापकैरनुष्ठेयः।

५ संयोजनम्। अधिगतज्ञानस्य ध्रुवत्वापादनाय तस्यान्यस्मिन् व्यतिकरे संयोजनमपि विधीयते। तदर्थं पाठगतभाषाविशेषानवलम्ब्य च्छात्राभ्यासार्थं गद्यसमस्यापूरणात्मका अन्ये च भाषाव्यवसायाः (Language Exercises) उपकल्प्यन्ते, ये नात्र सङ्क्षेपेणापि वर्णयितुं पार्यन्ते।

इयमेव सामान्यतो वाङ्मयाध्यापनस्य रीतिः। अत्र संवादपद्धतिः कथनपद्धतिरनुवादपद्धतिश्चेत्येताः सकला अपि यथाप्रसङ्गं यथास्थलं च कथं प्रयुज्यन्ते तथाऽन्विताभिधानाभिहितान्वयसमुच्चयपूर्वकं खण्डान्वयपद्धतिः कथमवलम्ब्यत इति सम्यग्दृष्टं स्यात्। तद्विवर्णनाध्यापनमिव कथासंवादकाव्याद्यध्यापनमपि प्रागुक्तरीत्यैव विधातव्यम्। तत्तद्विषये भेदास्तावदत्र उपस्थाप्यन्ते—

कथाध्यापनम्। १ कथाध्यापनेऽपि समुचितविषयप्रस्तावरूपेण कथान्तर्गतापरिचितपदानां परिचयः कार्यः। २ पश्चादध्येष्यमाणा समग्रकथा गुरुणा साभिनयं काकुविरामपुरस्सरं च गैर्वाण्यां कथनीया। एतादृशं कथाकथनं वाचनमात्रात्सुतरां परिणामावहम्। ३ अनन्तरं भवनमात्रेणैव

छात्रैः कथा कियद्दशेनावगतेत्याकलयितुं शिक्षकेण कथायाः पिण्डितार्थमुद्दिश्य त्रिचतुराः स्थूलप्रश्नाः प्रष्टव्याः। ४ तदनु पुस्तकस्था सैव कथा कथांशो वा सूक्ष्माध्ययनार्थमुपरिवर्णितरीत्या वाचनीयः शिक्षकेण। ५ अवशिष्ट सूक्ष्मप्रश्नविवरणादिकं तु पूर्वोक्तरीत्यैव विधेयम्।

नाट्यसंवादाध्यापनम्। (१) अपरिचितशब्दपरिचयरूपेण छात्रानुभवाश्रयिप्रश्नप्रतिवचनरूपेण वा प्रस्तावः कार्यः मातृभाषया संस्कृते वा। (२) शिक्षककृतं परिणामावहमभिनययुक्तं च द्विर्वाचनम्। प्रथमवाचनसमये छात्रैः स्वीयपुस्तकान्यनुद्धाट्यैव केवलं श्रोतव्यम्। (३) प्रश्नविवरणानुवादादिविधानं संवादगतरचनाविशेषाणां सोदाहरणमध्यापनं च। (४) साङ्घिकं वाचनम्। (५) छात्रविहितं साभिनयं संवादवाचनम्। नाटकस्थाः संवादाः प्राय एवमेवाध्यापनीयाः।



काव्याध्यापनम्।

सम्प्रतितनं काव्याध्ययनम्।

आङ्ग्लपाठशालासु भूयान् कालस्तिङन्तरूपसाधनिकायामन्येषां निष्प्रयोजनव्याकरणविभागानामध्यापने शुकवत्पठने च व्यतीयते। वर्षचतुष्टयपरिमित आङ्ग्लपाठशालागतसंस्कृताध्ययने प्रायो वर्षत्रयं यावत् प्राधान्येन व्याकरणाध्ययनं व्याकरणोदाहरणपराणां त्रुटितवाक्यानामाङ्ग्लानुवादश्चेति परिपाटी पूर्वं प्रचलिताऽऽसीत्। वाङ्मयाध्ययनं प्रारभ्यत तृतीये वर्षे, यदा पञ्चतन्त्रहितोपदेशादिगद्यग्रन्थानां केचिदंशा रघुवंशादिमहाकाव्यग्रन्थानां कश्चित्सर्गश्चेति वाङ्मयमध्येतव्यमासीत्। प्रारम्भे कानिचित्सुभाषितान्यप्यध्याप्यन्त, किन्तु तानि प्रायो नीत्युपदेशमात्रपराणि, न तु रसभावोद्बोधकानि। आङ्ग्लपाठशालागतस्यैतद्वाङ्मयाध्ययनस्यापर्याप्तत्वादध्येतारः पूर्वं बहिः

पाठशालायाः केषाञ्चिच्छात्रिणां सविधे वाङ्मयाध्ययननिरता अभवन्। अतः पूर्वतनाध्येतृणां संस्कृतनैपुण्यसिद्धावाङ्ग्लपाठशालीयाध्यापनपद्धतेरल्पीयानेवांश इति सुविज्ञातं भवेत् । इदानीमियं परिपाटी किञ्चित्परिवर्तनमापन्ना विद्यते । यथा—आङ्ग्लभाषामाध्यमं विहाय मातृभाषामाध्यमं संस्कृताध्ययने प्रयुज्यते, त्रुटितवाक्यस्थले च प्रोचककथासुभाषितप्रस्तावो बहुशः प्रारम्भत एव क्रियते । किन्तु वाङ्मयाध्ययनापेक्षया व्याकरणाध्यापन एव गरीयानाग्रहो विद्यतेऽद्याप्यदूरदृष्टीनामध्यापकानाम् । वाङ्मयबोधाय यद् व्याकरणज्ञानमनिवार्यं तस्मादप्यधिके निष्प्रयोजनव्याकरणपाठनेऽद्यापि कालयापनं विधीयते। एतत्परिपाटीफलं त्विदं यन्निष्प्रयोजनव्याकरणपठनगुरुभाराद्, वाङ्मयबोधायातिमात्रमपेक्षितं परिमितव्याकरणज्ञानमपि न स्थिरीभवति छात्रचेतःसु । एतावानाङ्ग्लपाठशालाध्यापकानां समादरः संस्कृतवाङ्मयाध्यापने,किमुत रसविस्तृतिपूर्णे काव्याध्यापने । गीर्वाणभाषाया निसर्गमाधुर्यमर्यगौरवं विविधरसभावसम्प्लुतत्वं च कदा ज्ञातव्यान्यध्येतृभिस्तेषां संस्कृताध्ययने वा कदा रुचिः सञ्जनितव्या, यदा तेषां भूरिकालं यावद्वाङ्मयेऽनधिगम्यमानाना व्याकरणरूपाणामेव पाठनं प्रचलेत् । अतो वाङ्मयबोधोपकारि तिङन्तस्थूलज्ञानसहितं सुबन्तकारकसमासतद्धितकृदन्तादि परिमितं व्याकरणं छात्रबुद्धौ स्थिरीकृत्यानतिक्रान्त एव काले प्रथमं गद्यवाङ्मयाध्ययनं तदुत्तरं च काव्याध्ययनमारब्धव्यम् । सम्प्रति यद्स्तीयः काव्यपाठनमाङ्ग्लपाठशालासु भवति तस्मिस्तु रसग्रहणापेक्षया भाषावबोधमात्रदृष्टिरेवाधिकतरं पुरस्क्रियते ।

सूक्ष्मव्याकरणज्ञानाधिगमस्य परिणते वयस्येव सुग्रहत्वादाङ्ग्लमहाविद्यालयेष्वेव लघु-मध्य-कौमुद्यादिद्वारा व्याकरणाध्ययनं पाठ्यक्रमे संनिवेशमर्हति । किन्तु तत्र व्याकरणाधीतेरत्यन्ताभावे काव्यनाटकादिवाङ्मयमात्राध्ययनं प्रवर्तते । आङ्ग्लमहाविद्यालयेषु तु सर्वत्राप्याङ्ग्लभाषामाध्यममेव संस्कृताध्यापने प्रयुज्यते, येन परिणतबुद्धीनामप्यध्येतॄणां संस्कृतटीकायापनपेक्षयाऽऽङ्ग्लानुवाद एव भूयसी रतिरिति नैसर्गिकमेव। अत्र तु लाभोऽयं यदाङ्ग्लभाषागतानां काव्यधर्मशाखाग्रन्थानामध्ययनेन भाववह्कल्पनप्रधानाया (Synthetic) दृष्टेर्व्यापकत्वं वैशद्यं च छात्रैरधिगम्येते, ययोरवदोजनं संस्कृतकाव्याध्ययनेऽपि विधातुं शक्यते । हानि-

श्लेषा यद्यपीतिना साहृदमात्राश्रयेण श्लोकमात्रमवशिष्यते, तेषां पद्यमाहि-माभिहते ध्वनिपर्यन्ते च ।

प्रयोजनम् ।

काव्याध्यापने न केवलं पदकारकज्ञानं पर्याप्तम् । पदकारकज्ञानेन तात्पर्यावगतिः सम्यग्वाच्यार्थबोधो वा गद्यस्यैव प्रयोजनम् । अतो विपुलगद्याध्ययनानन्तरं काव्याध्ययनं महते हिताय कल्पेत । 'वाक्यं रसात्मकं काव्यम्' इति काव्यलक्षणमधिकृत्य न केवलं तात्पर्यावगमो वाच्यार्थबोधो वा, अपि तु व्यङ्ग्यार्थद्वारेण नवरसाभिव्यञ्जनद्योतनाभ्यामपि "सद्यःपरनिर्वृतिः" इत्येव काव्याध्ययनाध्यापनयोः प्रमुखं प्रयोजनम् । या सहृदयानां चित्तैर्मनुष्यमात्रेऽन्तर्हिता कविजने चोद्रेकेणाभिव्यक्ता तस्याः कविवचोभिरेवोद्बोधनं, नयनयोर्मेषशालिन्या प्रतिभया प्रसादास्पदीकृतस्य कविविहङ्गमस्य मायाद्वसङ्कल्पपक्षाधारद्युलोकप्रभाभासुरेऽन्तरिक्षे सञ्चारः, —यथा, सीतारामाभ्यां सह व्योमयानमध्यास्योदधिमेखलालङ्कृतां लङ्कां परित्यज्यायोध्यानगरी गन्तव्या, रामगिर्याश्रमान्मेघदूतेन सह वा विहायसि सद्वर्यं यक्षेश्वराणां वसतिरलका गन्तव्या च विविधान् चित्तचक्षुर्दर्शयाना-लोकानवलोकयद्भी रसशर्मनेरिति सकलमौलिभूतं प्रयोजनं काव्यस्य । काव्यस्य नीत्युपदेशपरं प्रयोजनं यद्यप्युररीकृतं मम्मटेन, तथापि तत् 'कान्तासम्मिततया' एव, न तु प्राधान्येनेति समवबुद्ध्य काव्याध्यापने रसाभिव्यञ्जनपरैः सद्यः परनिर्वृतौ चैकाग्रदृष्टिभिः काव्याध्यापकैर्भाव्यम् ।

पद्यकाव्ययोर्भेदः ।

अत एव मर्मज्ञैः संस्कृतसाहित्यमीमांसकैः काव्यशब्दो रसदृष्टिं पुरस्कृत्यैव प्रयुज्यते । तद्दृष्ट्या गद्यं पद्यं चेत्युभेऽपि रसप्राधान्यात्काव्यकोटिमधिरोहत, न केवलं पद्यमेव काव्यव्यवच्छेदकम् । पद्यतुन्दिलेऽपि संस्कृतवाङ्मये तत्त्वचिन्तापरा वाच्यार्थकथनबहुला बहवश्छन्दोबद्धा ग्रन्था रसवैकल्यात्काव्यपदवीं नार्हन्तीति पूर्वतनसाहित्यविदामेव सिद्धान्तः । अन्यथा प्राक्तने काले बाणभट्टकृतौ कादम्बरीहर्षचरितग्रन्थौ, दण्डिनो दशकुमारचरितं, सुबन्धोर्वासवदत्ता चार्वाचीने कालेऽम्बिकादत्तव्यासविरचितः

शिवराजविजय इत्येते ग्रन्था गद्यबन्धं परिदधाना अपि भूयःपरिमाणेन काव्यरससम्भृताः कथं भवेयुः ?।

कीदृशानि काव्यान्यध्यापनीयानि।

नीत्युपदेशः काव्याध्ययनस्य गौणं प्रयोजनमिति विज्ञाय नीत्युपदेश-प्रधानानि सुभाषितानि नादावध्यापनीयानि। नीत्युपदेशपराणि सुभाषिता-न्येव काव्यमित्यन्यथाग्रहः परिवर्जनीयो मम्मटमतानुसारेण। सुभाषितरत्न-भाण्डागारस्थानि पशुखगाद्यन्योक्तिपराणि, 'उष्ट्राणां च गृहे लग्नम्' इति परिहासविनोदपूर्णानि, सुपुत्रकुपुत्रादिविषयैकावलम्बीनि द्वयोरभावदृष्टान्ता-दिभिः प्रपूरितानि सुबोधसुभाषितान्येव प्रारम्भ अध्ययनार्हाणि। तदनन्तरं रघु-कुमारकिरातादिपञ्चमहाकाव्याध्ययनात्प्राग् तेभ्योऽपि सुगमतराणि नैसर्गिक-कवित्वेनोद्भासमानानि, अपाणिनीयप्रयोगबाहुल्याच्छास्त्रिभिर्गजनिमीलिक-या दृश्यमानान्यपि प्रथितयशसां महाकवीनां स्फूर्तिप्रदानि रामायणमहाभारत-गतानि विविधरसपरिप्लुतप्रसङ्गवर्णनानि विभिन्नर्तुमनोहरदृश्यवर्णनानि चादावेवाभ्यासमर्हन्ति। किन्तु रामायणमहाभारतयोः वृत्तान्तकथनमात्रपरा-श्छन्दोरूपेणावतीर्णा अपि काव्यरसवैरस्याद् गद्यसदृशा विभागा नानुशीलन-योग्याः। पञ्चज्ञानेन्द्रियग्राह्यदृश्यानां वर्णनेन सुमनोहरकल्पनाभिश्च चित्त-चक्षुर्भ्यां दृश्यमालामुत्पादयतां, कल्पनाप्रतिबोधजननेनान्यादृशमालोकं प्रदर्शयतां, स्थूलदृष्टिं विस्मारयतामेव काव्यानामभ्यासः श्रेयान्।

अध्यापनाधिकारः।

न केवलमरसिकत्वेऽपि परीक्षोत्तरणार्थमेव साहित्यशास्त्राध्ययनं शुष्ककाष्ठभेदनमिवानुतिष्ठन्तः काव्याध्यापनेऽधिकारिणः। नैसर्गिकसहृदयत्वेन जीविते सुखे च प्रतिप्रसङ्गं प्रतिपलं काव्यं पश्यन्तस्तद्रसं चाकण्ठं निपीयाऽऽनन्दस्य परां कोटिं गच्छन्तः, सात्त्विकभावैस्तं बहिरनुभावयन्तः, काव्यं जीवितपयोनिधिमथितं नवनीतमेवेत्याकलय्य ग्रन्थगतेऽपि काव्यरसेऽ-तुलां निर्वृतिमनुभवन्तः, काव्यरसाभिव्यञ्जने साहित्यशास्त्रं साधनमात्रमिति याथार्थ्यमवबुध्य सहृदयतया तच्छास्त्राध्ययननिरता एव जनाः काव्या-ध्यापनेऽधिकारिणः। अन्येषामध्यापनं वाक्यार्थमात्रबोधनाय शुष्कपर्या-लोचनाय कल्पेत, न तु रसोत्कर्षाय।

प्रस्तावः। छात्राणां परिचितानुभवमधिष्ठाय तत्कल्पनाशक्तिप्रतिबोधजनकैः प्रश्नैः प्रस्तावः कार्यः। शक्यं चेत्प्रस्तूयमानविषयसन्दर्भानुसारेणैवाध्येष्यमाणकाव्यगतानां केषाञ्चिदपरिचितपदानामर्थं सुबोधपर्यायैर्विशदीकर्तव्यः। छात्रैर्ज्ञातपूर्वाणां विशिष्टपर्यायाणां तेभ्यो निष्कासनादनन्तरमेव तत्समानार्थानि श्लोकस्थितान्यपरिचितपदानि तैः पर्यायैः संयोज्य प्रवक्तव्यानि फलके लेखनीयानि चेत्ययमत्र क्रमः। किन्तु नूतनपदपरिचयकाले न कथमपि काव्यकेन्द्रवर्तिनी कल्पना सूचनीया। अन्यथा प्रस्तावपदस्य यौगिकोऽर्थः परिवर्तेत। प्रौढावस्थायां साङ्ख्यिकावर्तनं चित्रोपयोगो वा नापेक्ष्यते। चित्रोपयोगः काव्यशब्दैरुत्पद्यमाने जडचित्रातिशायिनि मनश्चित्रे व्याघातं जनयति। तस्माच्चित्रोपयोगः प्रौढावस्थायां विशेषतः काव्याध्यापने परिवर्जनीयः।

वाचनम्। समुचितप्रस्तावानन्तरं पाठ्यमानकाव्याशयस्य सन्दर्भप्रसङ्गादिकथनमुखेन लयस्वरसङ्क्रमविरामादियोजनया भावानुगुणं विशदं वाचनं, यथाशक्यं सुस्वरं चाध्यापकेन कर्तव्यम्। शास्त्रिप्रवराणां हरिकीर्तनकराणां पुराणप्रवक्तॄणां च श्रुतिमनोहरा श्लोकपठनपद्धतिरत्र *ग्राह्या*। पुस्तकमाश्रित्य काव्यवाचनमित्ययं सम्प्रतितनानामध्यापकानां निकृष्टः पन्थाः। अध्याप्यमानं काव्यं कण्ठस्थं चेत्तत्पठनं सविशेषं परिणामावहं भवति। *प्राचीनसम्प्रदायिनः शास्त्रिवरेण्या विपुलपद्यपङ्क्तीनां कण्ठगतत्वामुखपठनमात्रेणापि* काव्याध्यापनेऽलङ्कर्मीणाः। अत एव तेषां पठनं ग्रन्थबन्धनसमुत्सार्य लयं काकुं विरामादिभिरनिर्बन्धं रसभावाभिव्यञ्जकं भवति। *अधुनातनाध्यापकैरपीयमेव सरणिरनुसर्तव्या*। वाचनं पठनं वा यथावश्यं द्विस्त्रिर्वा कार्यम्। तत्परिणामावहं चेदसंशयं काव्यस्थूलार्थप्रतीतिं जनयति।

अध्यापकस्य सुमनोहरा वाचनपद्धतिरविवादं छात्राणामनुकरणबुद्धिं प्रबोध्य तानपि सम्यग्वाचनपटून् विदधाति। अतः काव्याध्यापनात्प्रागध्यापकेन गृहे स्वयं काव्यवाचनाभ्यासः कार्यः। समग्रकाव्यांशपठनं सामान्यतोऽर्थप्रतीतिकारिण्या गत्या समं लयसमन्वितं भवतु, येन काव्यांशश्छात्रैरधिगतार्थः स्यात्। काव्यगतः स्थायिभावो व्यभिचारिभावसनाथो,

घोषकारिणा '[1]अर्पणाख्य'–नादधर्मेण कथं प्रकाशनीयः, पाठ्यमानकाव्ये विशिष्टपदवाक्यांशास्थानसमवधानजननार्थं कथं [2]विसर्गपुरस्सरं (वर्णाघात-पूर्वकं) सुविशदमुच्चारणीयाः, काव्यपङ्क्तावसमाप्तायामप्यर्थावसानानुसारेण मध्येऽपि कथं [3]विरामानुबन्धौ प्रदर्शनीयौ, विविधभावानुगुणं कण्ठे कथं [4]दीपनप्रशमने सम्पादनीये, भावपरिवर्तनानुरोधेन कथं स्वरेण काकुर-भिव्यङ्क्तव्या, उच्चदीप्तमन्द्रनीचद्रुतविलम्बितादयः पाठ्यालङ्काराः समु-चितसंयोजनेन भावव्यक्तये कथमुपयोजनीया इत्यादि कृत्स्नमपि भारतीय-नाट्यशास्त्रगतपाठ्यधर्मानुरोधेन पूर्वं सम्यग्विमृश्यैव प्रकटपठनाभ्यासोऽ-ध्यापकेन गृहे कार्यः, काव्याध्यापनकाले छात्राणां पुरतः सकलं च तदा-विष्करणीयं, येन तेषां काव्यस्थूलार्थप्रतीतिः स्यात्, काव्यवृत्तचारुता यमकानुप्रासादिशब्दालङ्काराश्च श्लोकहृदयसन्तर्पकाः स्युः।

स्थूलप्रश्नाः। छात्राणां काव्यस्थूलार्थप्रतीतिं परीक्षितुं द्वित्राः प्रश्नाः प्रष्टव्याः, यैर्विविक्तश्लोकसूचितः समग्रकाव्यगतो मुख्याभिप्रायोऽभिव्यक्तः स्यात्, व्यभिचारिभावसङ्कुल एकरसपर्यवसायी स्थायिभावश्छात्रचित्तेषु सुस्थिरश्च भवेत्। मुख्याभिप्रायपरिज्ञानमेवाध्येतॄन् काव्यस्य सूक्ष्माध्ययने प्रवर्तयति।

सूक्ष्माध्ययनम्। सूक्ष्माध्ययनार्थं सन्दर्भान्वयसङ्गत्या रसभावपूर्णे-नान्तःकरणेन प्रश्नविवरणादिकमध्यापकेन प्रचालनीयम्। 'रमणीयार्थप्रति-पादकः शब्दः काव्यम्' इति पण्डितराजजगन्नाथोक्तमनुसारं रमणीयार्थ

---

१ अर्पणं नाम लीलावर्णस्वरेणापूरयदिव रङ्गं यत्पठ्यते (भा. नाट्यशास्त्रम्)।
२ विसर्गो नाम वाक्यन्यासः (भा. नाट्यशास्त्रम्)।

३ अर्थसमाप्तौ कार्यस्तथा च्छन्दोवशाद् दृश्यन्ते हि एकद्वित्रिचतुरक्षरा विरामाः, 'पदवर्णसमाप्ते च'। "समीक्ष्य वृत्ते कर्तव्यो विरामो रसभावतः। ये विरामाः स्मृताः काव्ये वृत्तनादसमुद्भवाः॥ तत्रस्थानि क्रमं तज्ज्ञैः कार्यास्तेऽर्थवशान्तरा॥ अनुबन्धः पदान्तरेष्वविच्छेदादनुच्छ्वासनम्॥
४ दीपनं नाम स्थानशोभि वर्धमानस्वरञ्च। प्रशमनं नाम तारं गतानां स्वराणामवैस्वर्येणावतरणमिति॥ (भा. ना. शास्त्रम्)

व्यङ्ग्यार्थे वा प्रतिपादयितुमर्थानुसारिण' शब्दाः कथ काव्ये प्रयुक्ता इति शब्दार्थोभयदृष्टिमाश्रित्य च्छात्राणा कल्पनाशक्तिं प्रस्फोरयन्तो रसभावोद्बोधकाः प्रश्ना विरचनीया., न पदकारकबोधमात्रपरा.। काव्यरसग्रहण पदकारकबोधमवलम्बत एव, किन्तु विपुलगद्याध्ययनेन च्छात्रहृदयेषु परिपाक प्राप्त एव कारकज्ञाने काव्याध्ययनमारम्भणीयम्। अस्मिन्नवसरेऽपेक्षितमपि तज्ज्ञान काव्यरसग्रहणापेक्षया गौणत्व भजते। कारकबोधः काव्याध्ययने रसभावकल्पनादिकमग्र प्रस्थाप्यैव स्वय साधनभूतः सन् कृतार्थीभवति। अत प्रश्नविवरणादिक प्राधान्येन रसभावकल्पनाभिव्यञ्जक यया परिपाट्या भवेत्सैव काव्याध्यापनेऽङ्गीकर्तव्या।

शास्त्रिवैरण्याना काव्याध्यापनशैली प्रायो रसोद्वाहिनी, यतस्तेषा प्रगाढवाङ्मयाध्ययन मन समाधिमाधायोन्नताभिरुचिमुत्पाद्य च तास्तादात्म्योत्साहसम्पन्नानेवाध्यापनकर्मणि नियोजयति। विपुलवाङ्मयास्वादजनित मध्यापकगत तादात्म्यमध्येतृष्वपि प्रतिफलित भूत्वा तेषा वाङ्मयाभिरुचि सवर्धयति। लोकशास्त्रकाव्याद्यवेक्षणाल्लब्धा निपुणता काव्यज्ञशिक्षया ऽभ्यासश्च शक्तिसहकृतौ यथा कवेः काव्योद्भवे तथा व्याख्यातुरपि सरसव्याख्यानकौशले हेतु। 'क्रियासिद्धिः सत्त्वे भवति महतां नोपकरणे' इत्युक्त्यनुसारेण रसविदो व्याख्यातुर्माहात्म्यमेवात्र हेतु', रीतिरकिञ्चित्करेति यद्यपि सत्य,तथाप्यावेदनरीतिज्ञान प्रज्ञावतोऽध्यापकस्योपोद्बलक,न तु हानिकरमिति—

> शिष्टा क्रिया कस्यचिदात्मसंस्था सङ्क्रान्तिरन्यस्य विशेषयुक्ता।
> यस्योभय साधु स शिक्षकाणा धुरि प्रतिष्ठापयितव्य एव॥

इत्येतस्मात्कालिदासवचनात्सिध्यति। पूर्वतनानां शास्त्रिवराणां वितत ज्ञान संस्कृतिसूचकाना विविधपौराणिकसन्दर्भाणां प्रपूर्णे पर्याप्तम्। मनोविनोदनपराणा कथादृष्टान्तादीना प्रकृष्टावगाहनवशात्तेषा काव्यविवरणोपयुक्त कथनकौशलमपि च्छात्रान्मन्त्रमुग्धानिव चित्रविन्यस्तानिव करोति। अत स्तेषा काव्यपाठनमतितरा निर्वृतिमादधदध्येतृहृदयेषु स्मृतिशाश्वर्योत्पादनेन चिरसंस्कारकर भवति। आधुनिकमनोविज्ञानानवगताअपि ते मनोविज्ञानाधिष्ठितान्येवाध्यापनतत्त्वान्यबोधपूर्वमेव केपुचिदवसरेषु परिपालयन्तीत्यत्र विषये प्रत्यक्षविद एव प्रमाणम्।

किन्तु तेषामध्यापनमिदानीन्तने काले कथनैकपरिपाटीमेवावलम्बते, न तु प्रश्नोत्तरपरिपाटीम्। तैः कथनप्रधानां दण्डान्वयपद्धतिं हित्वाऽऽधुनिकसंवादपद्धतेः साधर्म्यमापन्ना प्राच्यैरेवोद्भाविता प्रश्नोत्तरप्रधाना खण्डान्वयपद्धतिरध्यापने समाश्रयितव्येति साधीयान् पन्थाः। यतो दण्डान्वयपद्धतेमौखिकाध्यापनेऽनुसरणं—

पदच्छेदः पदार्थोक्तिर्विग्रहो वाक्ययोजना ।
आक्षेपोऽथ समाधानं व्याख्यानं पञ्चलक्षणम् ॥

इति रीत्या यद्यपि सम्यग्बोधाय कल्पते, तथापि तत् पदच्छेदकरी समासविग्रहादिपरा कर्तृकर्मक्रियाद्यन्वयभूयिष्ठा व्याकरणदृष्टिमेवाग्रे निधाय काव्यरसबोधेन एव पर्यवस्यति। काव्याध्यापने खण्डान्वयपद्धत्या विरचिताः प्रश्नास्तु कर्तृकर्मादिव्याकरणसंज्ञानुच्चारेऽपि 'किमो रूपं पुरस्कृत्य' द्रव्यगुणजातिक्रियादिवाचका विधातुं शक्यन्ते, येन प्रश्नसंसूचितद्रव्यगुणक्रियादिद्वारैव वाक्यगतपदानां कर्तृकर्मक्रियाबोधस्छात्रमनःसु स्वयमेवाविर्भूय, बोधप्ररोचनपूर्वकमत्युत्तरदाने तन्मतिं नियुज्य च शनैः शनैः काव्यरसं समुल्लासयतीति प्रयोगनिपुणानामध्यापकानामनुभूतिः। अतः खण्डान्वयपद्धति-

-नुभवाधिष्ठितः सिद्धान्तः । वैयक्तिकश्लोकस्य रसालङ्कारविवरणात्समग्र-काव्यपरिच्छेदस्य सङ्कलितसंवेदनमेव रुचिरतरम् । अत एव मुख्याभिप्राय रसदृष्टिं च प्रमुखीकृत्य शब्दार्थयो. समुचितसाहचर्यविषये प्रश्नविवरणादिक-मपेक्ष्यते । तदर्थमेव शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसगन्धसंवेदन काव्यगतपदसूचनेन पुनरु-द्भावयन्तश्चित्तचक्षुर्गोचराया हृदयसन्ततेरुत्पादने समर्थाश्च प्रश्ना विरच-नीयाः । भवतु नाम प्रश्नानां कार्यकारणबोधक तर्कानुसारित्व, किन्तु तर्कोऽत्र काव्यकल्पनाविलास एव रससाहाय्यमाचरन् काव्यसौन्दर्याभिव्यञ्जनाय भवतु, न तु रसविघाताय ।

काव्याध्यापने न केवल प्रश्नाः प्रष्टव्याः, किन्तु कथनपरिपाटीमाश्रित्य लयकाकुविरामाद्यलङ्कृतेन संस्कृतभाषणेन सोत्साह रसभावकल्पनाप्रति-बोधकर मनश्चित्रमालाजनक विवरणमपि कार्यम् । प्रश्नप्राचुर्ये काव्यविच्छेदने पर्यवस्यद्रसोत्कर्षं प्रतिबध्नाति । कथनातिरेकस्तु कविवचनसौन्दर्यं निह्नुत्य च्छात्राणा तन्द्रिलत्वमुत्पादयति । छात्रैः सम्यगवबुद्धायां काव्यकल्पनाया विवरणकथनयो. पौन पुन्यातिरेकः कदाचिद्रसप्रवाह स्तभ्नाति, कविवचन-वपुषो मूलसौन्दर्यं चावृणोति । अतः 'नामूल लिख्यते किञ्चिन्नानपेक्षितमुच्यते' इति मल्लिनाथोक्तिमनुसृत्य कब्युक्तपदवैदग्ध्य यया प्रश्नकथनप्रणाल्या प्रकाश्येत सैवाध्यापकेन मौखिकाध्यापनेऽङ्गीकार्या । कथनप्रणाली प्रश्नप्रणाली चेत्येतयो. समन्वयेत कविवचन पुरस्कृत्यैव प्रश्नमुखेन विहित विवरण यशस्वितामाप्नोतीति न कदापि विस्मरणीयम् । अध्याप्यमानकाव्यद्वारा कवेरेव च्छात्रैः सार्ध विश्रम्भालापो भवतु, न स स्वीयभाषणाधिक्येना-ध्यापकेन प्रतिष्टम्भितव्य इति सार. । विवरणसमये दुरूहस्थलेषु विशिष्ट-स्थलेषु च पौराणिकसन्दर्भप्रपूरणाय प्रासङ्गिकविषयावेदनाय सामान्यज्ञान-संवर्धनाय च मातृभाषोपयोगोऽनिर्बन्ध कार्य, यतश्छात्रसुबोधसिद्धिरेवा-ध्यापनस्य परम प्रयोजनम् ।

शास्त्रिणो वैयक्तिकश्लोकव्याख्यान यथा पदपदार्थविवृतिपुरस्सर कुर्वन्ति तथा पूर्वोत्तरश्लोकयोरन्योन्यसम्बन्धसिद्धयेऽपि तयोर्मध्ये टीकाग्रन्थानु-रोधेनावतरणिकामुपन्यस्यन्ति । एषाऽवतरणिकोत्तरश्लोकाभिप्राय संसूच्य तद्विषये जिज्ञासा चोत्थाप्य श्लोकरूपाणां विविधावयवानामन्योन्यसङ्घटनेन

समुचितविन्यासं साधयन्ती चित्तचक्षुषः पुरतोऽखण्डार्थरूपं रसवपुः संस्थापयति । एवंदीर्घविच्छेदनसहकृतमर्थसङ्कलनं काव्यरसावगाहनस्यातीवोपकुरुते । तस्मादेतट्टीकाग्रन्थस्य शास्त्रिभिरनुष्ठित चावतरणिकापूरणमाधुनिकाध्यापकैरप्युरीकर्तव्यम् । आदावध्यापकेन प्रत्येकश्लोकविवरणारम्भेऽवतरणिकामुपन्यस्य पूर्वोत्तरश्लोकयोः सम्बन्धः सङ्घटनीयः, तदनन्तरमध्याप्यमानश्लोकस्य प्रश्नविवरणसमाप्तौ तं श्लोकं पुनरप्यर्थप्रतीतिस्थैर्याय वाचयित्वा तदुत्तरश्लोकावतरणिका प्रस्ताव्या, तदनु पुनर्विवरणमारम्भणीयमिति सामान्यः पन्थाः । मुख्याभिप्रायमनुरुध्य काव्यपरिच्छेदगताना विविक्तश्लोकानामुपरिवर्णितमध्यापनमेव सुकुमारमतीनामध्येतॄणां समीचीनबोधकर भवति ।

कवेः कल्पनावैभवं वर्णनचातुर्यं रसप्रकर्षोऽलङ्कारयोजना पदलालित्यमिति विविधदृष्टीरङ्गीकृत्य स एव काव्यपरिच्छेदः पुनः पुनरप्यध्येतुं शक्यते । अस्मिन् व्यतिकरे काव्यपरिच्छेदस्थिताना श्लोकाना पूर्वापरक्रम परिवर्त्य वा तामुपरिदर्शितदृष्टिमनुरुध्यैव यद्यद् वस्तु परिच्छेदे लभ्यते, तस्य तस्य सङ्कलनाय प्रश्नविवरणाद्याश्रीयते । एव कल्पनावैभवदृष्ट्या वर्णनचातुर्यदृष्ट्या वा सञ्जाते प्रश्नविवरणादौ, रसप्रकर्षविषयिण्या पदलालित्यसम्बन्धिन्या वाऽन्यदृष्ट्या प्रश्नविवरणादिभिः समग्रपरिच्छेदेऽधिगम्यमानानि वस्तूनि सङ्कल्यन्ते । इत्थं प्रभिन्नदृष्ट्यवलम्बेन स एव काव्यपरिच्छेदस्तत्तद्विशिष्टवस्तूपलब्धये मुहुर्मुहुश्छात्रैर्वाचनीयः । एतादृशे काव्याध्यापने सङ्कलनदृष्टिरेव प्रधानपदं लभते; परमनधिगतकाव्यार्थानामनधीतकतिपयकाव्याना सुकुमारमतीना छात्राणामियं पद्धतिर्नोपकारिणी भवेत् । अभ्यस्तपर्याप्तकाव्याः परिणतमतय एव शिष्या ईदृशाध्ययनकर्मणः शक्ताः सन्तो महान्त लाभमावहेयुः । तस्मात्कस्मिंश्चित्काल श्लोकक्रमानुसारेणैव काव्यमध्याप्य सञ्जातपर्याप्ताभ्यासानामेव छात्राणामध्यापनेऽय पन्थाः समाश्रयणीयः ।

अलङ्कारज्ञानम् । प्रारम्भिकाध्यापने दृढालङ्कारज्ञानं नापेक्ष्यते, किन्तु छात्राणां प्रौढावस्थायां काव्यविवरणप्रसङ्गवशाद्यथावकाशं स्तोकमात्रं वितीर्य शनैः शनैः परिवर्धनीयम् । उपमाऽनन्वयरूपकभ्रान्तिमदपह्नुत्युत्प्रेक्षा-

दृष्टान्तव्यतिरेकाप्रस्तुतप्रशंसाश्लेषार्थान्तरन्यासादयः केचिद्विशिष्टालङ्कारा अध्याप्यमानकाव्यसन्दर्भानुरोधेनैव बोधनीयाः। उदाहरणभूतश्लोकस्थमुपमानोपमेयवाचकपदानां सादृश्यं तुल्यकक्षत्वं वा समुचितप्रश्नैश्छात्रेभ्यो निष्कास्य, उपमेयपदान्युपमानपदानि च स्तम्भद्वये समानपङ्क्तावेव फलके विलिख्य साधर्म्यं विशदीकर्तव्यम्। एवं विपुलोदाहरणैः परिचयं प्रापिते साधर्म्ये केनचित्कालेनालङ्काराभिधानलक्षणानि क्रमशोऽल्पाल्पमात्रया कथयितव्यानि। अधिगते चावसरे साधर्म्यमूलकालङ्कारभेदाः समानोपमानोपमेययोर्विभिन्नभङ्ग्यैव कथमुत्पद्यन्त इत्यधस्तनोदाहरणैः पृथक्कृते पाठे व्याख्येयम्।

यथा—'मुखं कमलमिव' (उपमा), 'मुखं मुखमिव' (अनन्वयः), 'मुखमेव कमलम्' (रूपकम्), 'कमलमिति भ्रमरा मुखमनुधावन्ति' (भ्रान्तिमान्), 'इदं कमलं, न मुखम्' (अपह्नुतिः), 'नूनं मुखं कमलं मन्ये' (उत्प्रेक्षा), 'जले कमलं, स्थले तव मुखम्' (दृष्टान्तः), 'मुखं कमलादतिरिच्यते' (व्यतिरेकः) इति। स्थालीपुलाकन्यायेन पाठशालायामेतावतैवालङ्कारज्ञानेनालम्। इयमीषदलङ्काराभिरुचिर्महाविद्यालयेष्वेव समुचितवेलायां काव्यप्रकाशादिग्रन्थगतालङ्काराणां सूक्ष्माभ्यासेन वृद्धिं प्राप्नुयात्।

वृत्तज्ञानम्। वृत्तज्ञानविषये तावद् वृत्तनामकथनमात्रान्नाधिकं किमपि काव्यरसग्रहणसमये कर्तुमिष्यते, यतो वृत्तलक्षणादिविवेचनेन काव्यरसोद्बोधो निरुद्धो भवतीत्यनुभवः। अतः पृथक्तया मातृभाषयैव बहूपयुक्तवृत्तलक्षणान्यध्याप्यानि, मातृभाषायामपि संस्कृतवृत्तानां प्रयोगप्राचुर्यात्। स्वतन्त्रे पाठे 'यमाताराजभानसलगम्' इति पङ्क्तेः साभिप्रायत्वं लघुगुरुक्रमेण गणपरिगणनोपयुक्तत्वं च विशदीकृत्याक्षरसङ्ख्यानुसारेण "अनुष्टुप्-आर्या—उपजाति—द्रुतविलम्बित—भुजङ्गप्रयात—वसन्ततिलका—मालिनी—पृथ्वी—मन्दाक्रान्ता—शिखरिणी—हरिणी—शार्दूलविक्रीडित—स्रग्धरा—" इत्यादीनां प्रचुरप्रयोगाणां वृत्तानां गणनिरूपणं छात्रैः कारयितव्यम्।

वृत्तयोजनाविवरणम्। अर्थानुसारिण्यास्तु वृत्तयोजनाया विवरणं काव्यरसग्रहणकालेऽपि रसाभिरुचिवर्धनपुरस्सरं विधातुं शक्यते। यथा—

कुमारसम्भवे 'अस्त्युत्तरस्यां दिशि देवतात्मा' इत्यादिश्लोकेषु गुरुवर्ण-प्राचुर्येण नगाधिराजस्य हिमवतो गुरुत्वविस्तीर्णत्वे कथमभिव्यज्येते, मेघदूते वा मन्दाक्रान्तावृत्तं यक्षहृदयस्थं विप्रलम्भजनितं जडिमानं कथं द्योतयतीति विवरणसमेतया विशिष्टपठनशैल्या ज्ञापनीयम्।

यथा वृत्तस्यार्थानुसारित्वं तथा विशिष्टवर्णसङ्घतेः समुचितार्थसूचकत्वं पदलालित्यं वा सुविशदपठनपूर्वकं प्रदर्शयितुं पार्यते। यथा कुमारसम्भवे—

यः पूरयन्कीचकरन्ध्रभागान्दरीमुखोत्थेन समीरणेन।
उद्गास्यतामिच्छति किंनराणां तानप्रदायित्वमिवोपगन्तुम्॥

इति श्लोके 'पूरयन्' इत्यस्मात्पदात्पूर्वमुपध्मानीयप्रयोगोऽवशिष्टे भागेऽनुनासिकप्रयोगश्च पवनाध्मानं पवनध्वनिमपि कथं सूचयतः, तथा—

कपोलकण्डूः करिभिर्विनेतुं विघट्टितानां सरलद्रुमाणाम्।
यत्र स्रुतक्षीरतया प्रसूतः सानूनि गन्धः सुरभीकरोति॥

इत्यत्र ककारटकारयोर्जिह्वामूलीयस्य संयुक्तवर्णानां च प्रयोगः करिणां कपोलघर्षणे दृढत्वं, कण्डूवेदनाया असहनीयत्वं, द्वितीयपङ्क्तौ च रकारो वृक्षक्षीरस्य झटिति बहिर्गमनं, तदुत्तरं सकारो वातप्रेरितं गन्धप्रसरणं च कथं स्पष्टयन्तीत्यादिरीत्या कृत्स्नमपि वर्णविन्यासवैदग्ध्यं प्रदर्शनीयम्। तथा मेघदूते च—

सङ्गीताय प्रहतमुरजाः स्निग्धगम्भीरघोषम्।

इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ पठ्यमानायां 'सङ्गीताय' इति पदेऽनुस्वारेण मधुरगीतं श्रुतिपथमायातीव, तथा 'प्रहत' इति पदेन सङ्गीतसहकारिणि मृदङ्गे कराघातः, तदनु 'स्निग्धगम्भीरघोषम्' इति पदेन मृदङ्गान्निष्पद्यमानो ध्वनिः श्रुयत इवेति प्रकटपठनपुरस्सरं प्रदर्श्य तत्र श्लाघावधानं समाकर्षणीयम्। एवं यमकानुप्रासयुक्तान्यनुकरणवाचकानि च पदानि विशेषतोऽवधानमर्हन्ति। तथा च समुचितपदप्रयोगपूर्वकं कविः कथं छन्दश्चित्रमाला-मुत्पादयतीत्येतदपि प्रभविवरणैः सद्रूपकद्रष्टया स्तोकमर्शयितव्ये पाठयितव्यम्।

पुनर्वाचनम्। एवं सप्रभविवरणात्सूक्ष्माध्ययनादनन्तरं सकलस्याध्यापितकाव्यांशस्य सहतपरिणामनिष्पत्त्येऽध्यापकेनादौ तदनु छात्रैः पठनीयं

यथाशक्य सुस्वरं गेयं वा। तदनु तेन च्छात्रैः सार्धं स एव काव्यांशः सहृदयः पठनीयो गेयो वा, येन काव्यार्थसौरभं स्वरमाधुर्येण साकं तेषां स्मृतिसम्पुटमभिव्याप्यताननुरणनकर्मणि नियोजयेत्, मृच्छकटिकनायकेन चारुदत्तेन सम च –

तं तस्य स्वरसङ्क्रमं मृदुगिरः श्लिष्टं च तन्त्रीस्वनं
वर्णानामपि मूर्छनान्तरगतं तारं विरामे मृदुम्।
हेलासंयमितं पुनश्च ललितं रागद्विरुच्चारितं
यत्सत्यं विरतेऽपि गीतसमये गच्छामि शृण्वन्निव॥

इति रीत्या तान् सञ्जातवेदान् विदध्यात्।

इत्थमेकस्मिन्पाठे त्रिचतुराः श्लोकाः समाप्यन्ते। काव्यपरिच्छेदः प्रदीर्घश्चेत्तस्य यथोचितखण्डान् परिकल्प्य प्रतिपाठं ते ते खण्डा उपरितन-प्रश्नविवरणरीत्या समाप्याः। आदिमे पाठे समग्रपरिच्छेदस्य स्थूलबोधं विधाय पश्चात्प्रतिपाठं नूतनश्लोकाः पूर्वश्लोकैः सह प्रश्नकथनपूर्वकं सयोज्याः। एवमवस्थिते समग्रकाव्यपरिच्छेदाध्यापनेऽध्यापकः पुनरावृत्तिपाठेनावशिष्ट-छात्रबोधवैकल्यं परिहर्तुं व्यवस्येत्।

नाटकाध्यापनम्।

नाटकस्य दृश्यकाव्यान्तर्भूतत्वात्तदध्यापनमपि पूर्ववर्णितरीत्यैव प्रायः कार्यम्। विशेषस्त्वयं यन्नाटकस्य सूक्ष्माध्ययनात्प्राग् हृदयहारिण्या सरण्या नाट्यकथावस्तुपरिचयो मुखतो विधातव्यः, येन ज्ञातपूर्वं नाट्यवस्तुविधानकं छात्राणामन्तःकरणेषु सामान्येन विस्पष्टत्वेन च स्थिरी-भूय बोधरुचिपुरस्सरं सूक्ष्माध्ययने तान् प्रवर्तयेत्। नाट्यवस्तुकथनमनु प्रतिसमयमध्येयान्नाटकखण्डान् परिकल्प्य ते पृथक्पृथक् कथितपूर्वान्नाट्य-शास्त्रगतपात्रधर्माननुसृत्य विविधपात्रस्वभावानुगुणं सकौशलं प्रतिपाठं वाचनीयाः। नाटकाध्यापने सम्यग्वाचनस्येयती महत्ती यद्विवरणं विनापि समीचीनवाचनमात्रेण प्रायो नाट्यविभागाः स्थूलत्वेनावगतार्था भवन्ति। अतोऽत्र विषयेऽध्यापकैरादौ सविशेषोद्यमः कार्यः। तदनु प्रश्नविवरणादीनि यथापूर्वमेवानुवर्तनीयानि। कथावस्तुक्रमात्पात्रप्रवेशादिक्रमः कथं भिद्यते, कथं च परिणामावहं इत्यपि विवरणसमये विवेक्तव्यम्। सूक्ष्माध्ययने ते

ते पात्रस्वभावविशेषा नाट्यप्रवेशानुरोधेन च्छात्रेभ्यः प्रश्नद्वारा निष्कासनीयाः, अध्यापकेन स्वयमपि कथनीया । समाप्ते तस्मिंस्तस्मिन् परिकल्पितखण्डाध्ययने प्रतिसमय पुनर्वाचनमिष्यत एव । अत्यवसरे छात्रैर्विविधभूमिकाः परिगृह्य समुत्कृष्टप्रवेशा नाटयितव्याः, येन तेषा भाषाज्ञान रसभावसंवेदन च परिपाक प्राप्स्येते ते च संस्कृतसभाषणनिपुणा अपि सम्पद्येरन् । एवमवसिते समग्रनाटकाध्ययने प्रत्यङ्कमुपलब्धा विशिष्टपात्रस्वभावविशेषाः पर्यालोचनपुरस्सर छात्रसाहाय्येन मुख्यतो लेखनतश्च सामान्येन सङ्कलनीयाः । प्रतिपात्रममुमेव विधिमनुसृत्य तत्तत्स्वभावविशेषाणामन्योन्यपोषकत्वं प्रदर्शनीयम् । एतत्तु स्मरणीय यन्नाटकाध्यापनमपि श्रव्यकाव्यमिवावयवविच्छेदनविरहेण रसप्रधाना सङ्कलनदृष्टि पुरस्कृत्यैव भवतु ।

उपसंहारः ।

काव्यपुरुषस्य रसरूपमात्मान, शब्दार्थरूप शरीर, रीतिरूपमवयवसंस्थानविशेषमुपमानुप्रासादिरूपानलङ्कारान् छन्दोरूपा गतिं चोद्दिश्य विहितानि प्रश्नविवरणानि अत्रैव तत्सौन्दर्यनिर्वर्णने प्रचीयमानामभिरुचिं सम्पादयन्ति, अल भूयसा, कवेर्निगूढान्तःकरणतत्त्वमेवावगाहन्ते च । किन्तु रसरूपमात्मान हित्वाऽन्यः सकलोऽपि च्छन्दोरीत्यलङ्कारादिनिरीक्षणव्यापारो विवेचकबुद्धिस्वतन्त्रत्वात्परिणतप्रज्ञानामेवाध्येतृणामध्यापने पदमर्हतीति न कदापि विस्मर्तव्यम् । यथा पाठशालाध्येतृणा बालाना तथा महाविद्यालयस्थानां प्रौढच्छात्राणामध्यापने रससाधारण्य नान्तरीयकमेव । तथापि च्छन्दोऽलङ्कारादिविवेचनं शिष्यबुद्धिस्वत्यनुरोधेन यथोत्तर सवर्धनीय, न त्वेकपदे । प्राचीनपद्धतौ काव्याध्ययनानन्तर साहित्यग्रन्थपठनपुरस्सर यथा छात्राः काव्यरसालङ्कारगवेषणादीला अभियन्त, तथाऽधुनापि महाविद्यालयेषु क्रियन्त एव । किन्तु विच्छेदकबुद्धिनिष्ठमलङ्कारपरिज्ञान रसतत्त्वप्रधानस्य साहित्यशास्त्रस्यैकतममङ्गमेव न तु सामान्येन काव्यरसग्रहणायालम् । अतः प्रौढच्छात्राध्यापनेऽपि मनोविज्ञानानुसारेण भावैकतत्त्व समवलम्ब्य संश्लेषणदृष्ट्यैव काव्यविवरणमिष्यते, न त्वलङ्कारभेदनिरूपणपरया विश्लेषणदृष्ट्या । विहितमप्यलङ्कारविवरण काव्यगतरसाभिव्यक्तेः साधक भवतु, न तु बाधकम् ।

बालाध्यापने पुनरेतद्विवेचन पाठशालासु लभ्यमान संस्कृताध्ययन-कालावधिमवलम्बते, न च सकलमपि तत्र सम्पूर्णत्वेन विधातु शक्यम्। अतः प्रथितयशसां महाकवीनां काव्येभ्यः समुत्कृष्टावतरणानि सङ्गृह्यैव तेषामध्यापन पाठशालासु विधेयम्। सर्गद्वयात्मकमपि काव्यमुपरिदर्शित-रीत्याऽध्याप्येत चेदन्वर्थं काव्यरसानुराग जनयेत्, व्यासवाल्मीकिकालिदास-भवभूत्यादीनां चिरन्तनवाग्रसधाराया अविकलास्वादनाय च्छात्रान् प्रवर्त-येदित्यत्र न कापि विप्रतिपत्तिः सम्भाव्यते। अपि च खण्डान्वयपद्धत्या संस्कृते विहित मौखिकविवरण तादृशलिखितविवरणप्रधानानां टीकाग्रन्थानां वाचने कुतूहलमुत्पाद्य तत्साहाय्येन च्छात्रान्टीकानुशीलनपरान् पूर्वतन-शास्त्रिशिष्यानिव स्वयमेवार्थनिर्धारणाभिमुखान् कुर्यात्। समासतो वक्तव्ये सति, गीर्वाणभारत्या तद्गतविशालवाङ्मये च कियद्भाववैविध्य, कियान् रसप्रकर्षः, कियद्वर्णमाधुर्य, कियान् पदवाक्यपाकः, कियद्वा रीतिवैचित्र्य-मित्यत्र विषये स्थालीपुलाकन्यायमनुसृत्य समुत्कृष्टावतरणाध्ययनेनापि पाठशालाछात्रहृदयेषु यदीयदुद्बोधः स्यात्तदा काव्याध्यापनमवश्य साफ-ल्यमियात्।

पुनरेकस्यैव कवेः काव्यकृतिषु रतिविलापाजविलापयोरिव प्रसङ्गवर्ण-नादिसादृश्य विभिन्नसन्दर्भानुसारेणापि कथमुपलभ्यते, समानप्रसङ्गमधिकृत्य प्रभिन्नकविकृतिषु कुन्दमालोत्तररामचरितयोरिव कथ भेदसाम्ये परिलक्ष्येते, शकुन्तलादुष्यन्तयोर्मालविकाग्निमित्रयोरुर्वशीपुरूरवसोरिव नायिकानायकयो पूर्वरागो विशिष्टकविना विविधकविभिर्वा कथ प्रदर्शितः, कविविशेषस्य प्रकृतिवर्णनविषये किं प्रवृत्तिवैशिष्ट्य मनोऽधिष्ठान वा, कश्च तस्य जीवित-तत्त्वालोक इति विविधविषयान् परिलक्ष्यीकृत्य काव्यनाटकादिसमीक्षाऽनुष्ठातु शक्या। नाटकसमीक्षायां पुनर्नाट्यवस्तुनः पुरातनकथावलम्बः कल्पितत्व वा, पुरातनकथावलम्बेऽपि कवेरसाधारण्य प्रतिभानवत्त्व वा, नाट्यगत-घटनासिद्धयेऽपेक्ष्यमाणा कालमर्यादा, नाट्यकवेरुपलभ्यमानमितिवृत्त, तत्का-लीना समाजस्थितिः, नाटकस्थरसाना कथोपकथानां चाङ्गाङ्गिभावः, नाट्य शास्त्रनियमानां कविकृत परिपालनमतिक्रमण वा, कविकृतौ प्रतीयमानस्य जीविततत्त्वालोकस्यान्यकविभ्यो वैशिष्ट्यमिति विविधविषया अपि विवेचनार्हा भवन्ति। एषा समग्रकृतिसमीक्षा विविक्तश्लोकालङ्कारादिकथनाद् भिन्ना

ततो भावसंश्लेषणमेवाधिकतरमभिप्राय कविचित्तावगाहनोपनिषदी भवति। परमेतत् महाविद्यालयीनप्रौढच्छात्रेष्वेव युज्यते, न बालेषु। पूर्वकल्पितानां तज्ज्ञाते काव्याध्यापने छात्रा मनोबुद्धिविकासानुरोधेन निश्चित प्रयोजनविवक्षिताया काव्यसमीक्षायां सम्प्रवृत्ताः स्युः। कविकालनिर्णयः, कवीनां पूर्वोत्तरभाव इत्यादयो विषया अमन्दमतिप्रबलां ऐतिहासिकदृष्टया योगयुक्ताः सन्तोऽपि कविहृदयसमीक्षापेक्षया बहिरङ्गभूताः काव्यरसनिरासकाः रसास्वादप्रत्यूहस्य विफलकालयापनकाश्च। कविकालीनायाः समाजस्थितेः संस्कृतेश्च काव्योपलभ्यसन्दर्भैर्निरीक्षणं तु कविव्यक्तित्वनिदर्शनोपकारकमपि विवेचकबुद्धिनिष्ठमेव। अतः कविचित्तावगाहननिष्ठा काव्यसमीक्षा समाश्रित्यैव रसज्ञसमीक्षकैर्लेखनमतिर्विधेया। संस्कृतवाङ्मयसमीक्षणस्य न्यूनत्वं पूरयितु यावन्तो नूतनसमीक्षका बद्धपरिकरा भविष्यन्ति तावन्तोऽपेक्ष्यन्त एव॥

—०—

काव्याध्यापने परिशिष्टम्।

पाठादर्शः।

श्रेणिः—माध्यमिकशालीया पञ्चमी। कालावधिः—अर्धघटिकापरिमितः।

विषयः—शरद्वर्णनपराः श्लोकाः।

शरद्वर्णनविषयकाणां केषाञ्चिच्छ्लोकानां सम्यगध्यापनरीतिरुपदर्श्यते। प्रकृतिवर्णनविषयकाः श्लोकाश्छात्रेभ्योऽतीव रोचन्ते। अतस्तादृशा एव प्रारम्भिकाध्यापने ग्राह्याः। ऋतुप्रकृतिवर्णनपरेषु श्लोकेषु तत्तस्मिन्नेव ऋतौ पाठितेषु तदनुभवानां सम्यगनुभूत्याऽध्यापनं नितान्त रसप्रबोधकरं भवति। पाठादर्शगताः प्रश्नाः, प्रश्नोपादका विवरणपदानि च वाक्यया अध्यापकेन प्रयोक्तव्याः। छात्राणामपेक्षितानि प्रत्युत्तराणि ( ) इत्यर्ध-

चन्द्रचिह्नद्वये स्थापितानि । अध्यापकेन कर्तव्यं विवरणं कदाचिदर्धचन्द्रचिह्नद्वयाद्बहिः कदाचिच्च [ ] इति समकोणचिह्नद्वये स्थापितम् । प्रायोऽत्र विसन्धिलेखनमनुसृतम् ।

१ प्रस्तावः । छात्राणां परिचितानुभवमधिष्ठाय प्रश्नाः ।

यदा पर्जन्यः वर्षति तदा कः ऋतुः ? (वर्षाः) । पर्जन्यकाले–वर्षाकाले मेघाः जलं वर्षन्ति । मेघाः वर्णेन कीदृशाः ? (कृष्णाः) । मेघाः कुत्र दृश्यन्ते ? (आकाशे) । आकाशस्य कानि नामान्तराणि ? (नभः, गगनम्, अम्बरम् इति) (छात्रैर्ज्ञातपूर्वाणामेव पर्यायाणां निष्काशनमत्र शक्यम् । यदि पर्यायाः श्लोकगताश्छात्रैरज्ञातपूर्वाश्च, तर्हि तेऽस्मिन्नेव सन्दर्भेऽध्यापकेन कथनीयाः, फलके ज्ञातपदैः सम लेखनीयाश्च) । वर्षाकाले जलं वर्णेन कीदृशम् ? (आरक्तम्) । कस्मात्कारणात् आरक्तम् ? (तत्पङ्केन मलिनं, तस्मात्) । वर्षाकाले वायुः कथं वहति ? (वेगेन) । वायोः कानि नामान्तराणि ? (पवनः, वातः, अनिलः इत्यादीनि) । वर्षाकाले वनं वर्णेन कीदृशम् ? (हरितम्) । वर्षर्तोः अनन्तरं कः ऋतुः आगच्छति ? (शरदृतुः) । शरदि आकाशं वर्णेन कथम्भूतम् ? (नीलम्) । कस्मात्कारणात् नीलम् ? (तत्र मेघाः न सन्ति, तस्मात्) । [अतः आकाशं निरभ्रम् । तस्य वर्णः नीलः निर्मलः विधौतः वा,–इति विवरणेन श्लोकगतः 'विधौत'–शब्दः नूतनत्वात् कथनीयः फलके लेखनीयश्च] शरत्काले जलं वर्णेन कथम्भूतम् ? (निर्मलम्) । शरत्काले वायुः कथं वहति ? (मन्दं मन्दम्) । शरत्काले वनभागाः वर्णेन किम्भूताः ? (पीताः प्रसन्नाश्च) । तर्हि वर्षाकालः शरत्कालः च इति उभौ ऋतू युष्माभिः दृष्टौ । तयोः कः अतीव रम्यः ? (शरत्कालः) ।

२ सन्दर्भादिकथनम् । अद्य वयं शरत्कालस्य रम्यं वर्णनं वाचयाम । एतद्वर्णनं श्रीवाल्मीकिना रामायणे कृतम् ।

३ अध्यापकस्य वाचनम् । पूर्ववर्णितरीत्या द्विः कार्यम् । प्रथमवाचनसमये छात्रैः पुस्तकानि नोद्घाटयितव्यानि । केवलं श्रवणेनैवार्थः पदमाधुर्यं च बोद्धव्ये, अध्यापकस्य पठनरीतिरभिनयश्च सन्द्रष्टव्यौ । प्रथमवाचनात्पूर्वं "एतेषु श्लोकेषु यानि श्रुतिमधुराणि पदानि तानि चित्तेषु

स्थिराणि कुरुत । वाचनानन्तरं कथयत च" इति छात्रसमवधानजननार्थं निवेदनीयम् । द्वितीयवाचनात्पूर्वं तानि पदानि छात्रेभ्यो निष्कास्य फलके लेखनीयानि । द्वितीयवाचनसमये छात्रैः पुस्तकान्युद्घाटनीयानि । एवमध्यापकस्य द्विर्वाचनं समाप्तं स्यात् ।

पाठनीयाः श्लोकाः ।

जलं प्रसन्नं कुसुमप्रहासं क्रौञ्चस्वनं शालिवनं विपक्वम् ।
मृदुश्च वायुर्विमलश्च चन्द्रः शंसन्ति वर्षव्यपनीतकालम् ॥१॥
विपक्वशालिप्रसवानि भुक्त्वा प्रहर्षिता सारसचारुपङ्क्तिः ।
नभः समाक्रामति शीघ्रवेगा वातावधूता ग्रथितेव माला ॥२॥
व्यक्तं नभः शस्त्रविधौतवर्णं कृशप्रवाहाणि नदीजलानि ।
कह्लारशीताः पवनाः प्रवान्ति तमोविमुक्ताश्च दिशः प्रकाशाः ॥३॥

४ छात्राणां मनोगतं वाचनं, स्थूलप्रश्नाश्च । तदनु १ के शंसन्ति ? २ सारसपक्षिणां पङ्क्तिः किं करोति ? ३ कथम्भूताः पवनाः प्रवहन्ति ? इति स्थूलप्रश्नत्रयमुद्दिश्य छात्रैः श्लोकानां मनोगतं वाचनं कार्यम् । अस्मिन् समये कानिचिदपरिचितपदान्यध्यापकेन छात्रसन्देहानुसारं विशदीकर्तव्यानि । अनन्तरमुपरितनैरेव स्थूलप्रश्नैश्छात्रबोधः परीक्षणीयः ।

५ सूक्ष्माध्ययनम् । तदनन्तरं प्रश्नविवरणादिद्वारा पूर्वदर्शितरीत्या सूक्ष्माध्ययनं कार्यम् । यथा—

(अ) प्रथमश्लोकविवरणम् । जलं कथम्भूतं दृश्यते ? (प्रसन्नम्) । कस्मात् कारणात् तत् प्रसन्नम् ? (तत् निर्मलं स्वच्छं वा, तस्मात्) [वर्षाकाले तत् पङ्केन युक्तं पङ्किलं वा आसीत् । अधुना पङ्कः जलस्य तले स्थितः, अतः तत् प्रसन्नम्] । तस्मिन् जले हसन्ति–प्रहसन्ति–प्रकर्षेण हसन्ति, कानि तानि ? (कुसुमानि) [पुष्पाणि, प्रसूनानि वा] । यदा यूयं हसथ, तदा युष्माकं मुखानि विकसन्ति । अत्र कुसुमानि प्रहसन्ति, तर्हि तानि कीदृशानि ? (तानि विकसितानि) । कुसुमानां प्रहासः जले वर्तते, तर्हि तत् जलं किम्भूतम् ? (कुसुमप्रहासम्) [अत्र समासविग्रहः प्रकारान्तरेण कर्तुं शक्यते इति दृष्टं स्यात्] । पुनश्च तस्मिन् जले स्वनः स्वरः श्रूयते, केषाम् ? (क्रौञ्चानाम्) [अत्र छात्राणां विस्तरबोधार्थं

मातृभाषापर्यायोऽपि निवदनीयोऽध्यापकेन]। क्रौञ्चा • कथ शब्दायन्ते ? (उच्चै)। केन कारणन उच्चै ! (त आनन्दिता)। तर्हि जल पुन कीदृशम् ? (क्रौञ्चस्वनम्) [क्रौञ्चस्वनमिति विशेषणपद 'शालिवनम्' इति विशेष्यपदनापि अन्वित स्यात् । अतस्तथा प्रश्ना अपि सम्भविष्यन्ति] पुनश्च शालीना वन–क्षत्र जलस्य समीपे एव वर्तते । [महाराष्ट्रभाषागत 'साळी' इति शब्दोऽप्यत्र कथनीय] कवि शालिवन वर्णयति, कन शब्दन ? ('विपक्वम्' इति) [शालिवन विशेषेण पक्वम्, न अधुना कोमलम्] अत तद् वर्णेन कीदृशम् ? (पीतम्)। [यथा सुवर्ण शोभनवर्ण तथा शालिक्षत्रम् अपि । पीत शालिवन सुवर्णमिव मनोहर दृश्यत ।] सुवर्ण धनिकाना धनम् । शालिवनमपि सुवर्णमव, केषाम् ? (कृषीवलानाम्)। [धान्यमव कृषीवलाना धन सुवर्ण वा ।] अस्मिन् क्षेत्रे वायु अपि वहति–वाति [पुरस्तनश्लोकगत पदमत्र बुद्धया प्रयोज्यम्] कीदृश वायो स्पश ? (मृदु) [वायु मन्द मन्द वहति–वाति, तस्मात् स: मृदु ।] वायु क्षेत्र वहति । स शालीना गन्धमानयति । कीदृश स गन्ध ? (मधुर)। शरत्काले रात्रौ चन्द्र किम्भूत दृश्यते ? (विमल) चन्द्रात् मल विगत, दूर नीत, व्यपनीत । [पुरस्तन शब्द इत्यमादा वेवोचितस दर्भे कथनीय] अत स विमल । विमलत्वस्य किं विशिष्ट कारणम् (आकाश निरभ्रम् इति)। चन्द्र वर्णेन कीदृश ? (शुभ्र), चन्द्रस्य किरणाना स्पर्श कथम्भूत ? (शीतल)। चन्द्र शुभ्र शीतलश्च, अत एव स नयनयो आन दकर । तर्हि अत्र शसन्ति–प्रशसन्ति–स्तुवन्ति, कानि ? (जलम्, शालिवनम्, वायु, चन्द्र च) [एतानि कर्तृवाचक पदानि अत्र एकैकश निष्कासनीयानि] एतानि क शसन्ति ? (व्यपनीतकालम्) [एतस्मात् शरत्काल त् वर्षं वृष्टि वर्षर्तु वा व्यपनीतः दूर नीत । तस्मात् अत्र शरत्काल 'व्यपनीतकाल ' इति कवि वक्ति। उपरिवर्णिता सर्वे रम्यण शरत्कालन आनन्दिता त स्तुवन्ति, "असुखकर वर्षर्तु गत, सुखकर शरत्काल आगतश्च इति वदन्ति इव]

(आ) प्रथमश्लोकवाचनम्– थूणानिखनन्यायेनाथदृढीकरणार्थं पुनरपि कार्यम् ।

(इ) द्वितीयश्लोकावतरणिका । अधुना आकाशे शालिक्षेत्रे च मनोहरा शोभा दृश्यते, तां वयं पश्यामः ।

(ई) द्वितीयश्लोकस्य वाचनं विवरणं च । अथ समाक्रामति [अभिनयदर्शनम्] व्याप्नोति, सर्वत्र प्रसृता भवति, केषां पङ्क्तिः माला वा ? (सारसानाम्) [जलस्य तीरे वसतां सारसपक्षिणां हंसानाम् इत्यर्थः ।] कविः तां पङ्क्तिं वर्णयति, केन पदेन ? ('चारु' इति पदेन) । सारसानां चारुः मनोहरा शोभना पङ्क्तिः वर्तते । [सा कुतः मनोहरा तद्वय पश्यामः] सा पङ्क्तिः समाक्रामति, किम् ? (नभः) [नभः, आकाशम्, गगनम् । 'नभोऽन्तरिक्षं गगनमनन्तं सुरवर्त्म खम्' इत्यमरः । सारसपङ्क्तिः आकाशे इतस्ततः सञ्चरति इत्यर्थः ।] कविः सारसपङ्क्तेः वेगं वर्णयति, केन पदेन ? ('शीघ्रवेगा' इति पदेन) [सा पङ्क्तिः न मन्दं मन्दं गच्छति, किन्तु शीघ्रं झटिति आकाशे उड्डयते, तस्मात् तस्याः वेगः शीघ्रः वर्तते] पुनश्च सा पङ्क्तिः प्रहर्षिता—प्रकर्षेण हर्षिता—अतीव आनन्दिता, किं कृत्वा ? (भुक्त्वा) भुक्त्वा नाम भक्षयित्वा । किं भुक्त्वा सा प्रहर्षिता ? (विपक्वशालिप्रसवानि) प्रसवानि नाम मञ्जरीः कणिशानि [महाराष्ट्रभाषाया 'ओम्बी' 'कणीस' इति उच्यते] तानि प्रसवानि केषाम् ? (शालीनाम्) । शालयः पुनः किंविशिष्टाः ? (विपक्वाः) । शालीनां मञ्जर्यः विपक्वाः, पीताः, रुचिकरैः तण्डुलकणैः पूर्णाः, ताः भक्षयति सारसपङ्क्तिः । [यदा क्षेत्रं धान्यसम्पन्नं भवति, तदा बहवः खगाः तत्र आगच्छन्ति, धान्यकणान् यथेष्टं भक्षयन्ति च इति युष्माभिः दृष्टमेव । अतः सारसपङ्क्तिः तण्डुलकणान् यथेष्टं भक्षयित्वा प्रहृष्टा सती आकाशे झटिति उड्डयते इत्यर्थः ।] तदा सा का इव दृश्यते ? (माला इव) । कीदृशी सा माला स्यात् ? (पुष्पाणाम्) किंलक्षणा माला इव ? (ग्रथिता) [ग्रथिता नाम रचिता—केन अपि गुम्फिता] पुनः सा माला अवधूता [अभिनयदर्शनम्] चालिता कम्पिता, केन ? (वातेन) [वातेन कम्पिता पुष्पाणां माला यथा मनोहरा दृश्यते, तथा इयं सारसपङ्क्तिः अपि इत्यर्थः ।]

(उ) प्रश्नानोपमेयदर्शनम् । अथ सारसपङ्क्तिः कया तुलिता ? (पुष्पाणां मालया) । सारसपङ्क्तिः शीघ्रवेगा, तर्हि माला कथम्भूता ?

(वातावधूता)। माला यथा ग्रथिता तथा सारसपङ्क्तिः अपि ग्रथिता सङ्घटिता एव।

सारसपङ्क्तिः।

उपमेयम्	उपमानम्
सारसपङ्क्तिः	पुष्पमाला
शीघ्रवेगा	*वातावधूता*

ग्रथिता

[यथाशक्य सारसपङ्क्तेश्चित्रम् उपरिलिखितरीत्या फलके आलेखनीयम्, उपमानोपमेयभावश्च उपरितनप्रश्नैः सह उपरिस्थितरीत्या फलके विशदीकार्यः। प्रारम्भे 'उपमेयम्' 'उपमानम्' चेत्येतयोः पारिभाषिकशब्दयोरुपयोगं *विनैव सादृश्य विशदीकर्तव्यम्।*]

(ज) पुनरपि द्वितीयश्लोकवाचनम्।

(ऋ) तृतीयश्लोकावतरणिका। पुनः कविः शरदः सौन्दर्यं प्रकारान्तरेण वर्णयति, तद् वयं पश्यामः।

(ऋ) तृतीयश्लोकस्य वाचनं विवरणं च। कविः नभः आकाशं वर्णयति, काभ्यां पदाभ्याम्? ('व्यक्तम्' 'शस्त्रविधौतवर्णम्' च इति)। अत्र नभसः वर्णः किंभूतः? (विधौतः) विधौतः अतिनिर्मलः *उज्ज्वलः च। किम् इव उज्ज्वलः? (शस्त्रम् इव) [शाणशिलायां शस्त्रं* घृष्यते, तदा शस्त्रं निर्मलम् उज्ज्वलं च दृश्यते, तथा नभसः वर्णः अपि दृश्यते। नभः अपि निर्मलम् उज्ज्वलं च दृश्यते] नभः निर्मलम् उज्ज्वलं च, अत एव पुनः तत् कीदृशं दृश्यते? (व्यक्तम्) [व्यक्तं सुस्पष्टम्

इत्यर्थः। यतः नभः विधौतम्, ततः एव तत् व्यक्तं सुस्पष्टं वा। नभसः नैसर्गिकं नीलत्वं सुस्पष्टं दृश्यते इत्यर्थः] नभः नीलम् उज्ज्वलं च दृश्यते, किम् अत्र विशिष्टं कारणम्? (तत्र मेघाः न सन्ति)। वर्षाकाले एतद् नभः अदृश्यत एव, किन्तु तदा कः तस्य वर्णः? (कृष्णः, मलिनः)। कैः सः कृष्णः? (मेघैः)। कृष्णैः मेघैः तदा सर्वत्र अन्धकार इव तम इव आसीत्। अधुना नभः निर्मलम् उज्ज्वलं च। अतः सर्वाः दिशः कथम्भूताः? (तमोविमुक्ताः)। तमसः अन्धकारात् दिशः विमुक्ताः विशेषेण मुक्ताः। अत एव पुनश्च ताः दिशः कीदृश्यः? (प्रकाशाः)। [प्रकाशयुक्ताः, प्रकाशिताः।] अधुना नदीनां जलानि कीदृशानि? (कृशप्रवाहानि)। नदीनां प्रवाहाः कृशाः सञ्जाताः, न तु प्रभूतं जलं तेषु। वर्षाकाले नदीनां प्रवाहाः किंविशिष्टाः आसन्? (विशालाः) [पर्जन्यवृष्ट्या नदीनां प्रवाहाः उभे कूले–तटे उत्तीर्य सर्वत्र प्रसृताः। महान् जलपूर एव आसीत् नदीषु। सर्वत्र जलं जलमेव। किन्तु सम्प्रति नदीप्रवाहाः कृशाः प्रसन्नाश्च। अधुना पवनाः वाताः प्रवान्ति–प्रवहन्ति। ते स्पर्शेन कीदृशाः (शीताः) [ते अधुना शीताः, किन्तु सुखकरा अपि, न तु पर्जन्यवाता इव पीडाकराः] पवनाः कैः शीताः? (कह्लारैः)। [कह्लाराणि नाम श्वेतकमलानि तैः पवनाः शीताः] तर्हि कह्लाराणि कुत्र विकसितानि स्युः? (जले)। जलं जलस्थानि कह्लाराणि च स्पृष्ट्वा पवना आगच्छन्ति, अतः पवनाः गन्धेन कीदृशाः? (मधुराः)। कीदृशः तर्हि अयं शरत्कालः? (अतीव सुखकरः)।

(ल) अध्यापकेन कार्यं सर्वेषां श्लोकानां पुनर्वाचनम्।

६ पदसौष्ठवनिरीक्षणम्। 'नभः समाक्रामति शीघ्रवेगा' इत्यत्र लघुगुरुवर्णानां क्रमः सारसपङ्क्तेर्हरितुल्यवर्तनं, नभसो विशालोदरत्वं, तत्र च सारसानां वेगं कथं द्योतयति, 'वाताबधूता ग्रथितेव माला' इति पदान्यपि गगन एव सारसानामूर्ध्वमधस्तिर्यग्गमनं कथं सूचयन्ति, तथा "कह्लारशीता ≍ पवना ≍ प्रवान्ति" इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ हकारोऽष्मानीययोजनया पवनस्य ध्वनिर्वहनं च कथं सूच्यते, तद्विशिष्टरचनशैल्या प्रदर्शनीयमिति दिक्।

चित्रपाठत्वनिरीक्षणम्। युष्माभिः अधीतं वर्णनम् अधिकृत्य चित्रकारेण एक चित्रम् आलेखनीयं स्यात्, तर्हि तत्र कानि कानि वस्तूनि

आलेख्यानि, के के च वर्णाः कुत्र उपयोज्याः, इत्युक्तिपुरस्सरं प्रश्नाः प्रष्टव्याः । तैश्च—

"नील जलम् । जले श्वेतानि कुसुमानि (कह्लाराणि ?) । तीरे श्वेताः क्रौञ्चाः । तीरे विपक्व (पीत) शालिवनम् । शालिप्रसवानि भक्षयन्तः केचित्सारसाः (श्वेताः ?) नीलमुज्ज्वलं च नभः । नभस्युत्पतन्ती केषाञ्चित्सारसानां पङ्क्तिः (श्वेता) ।"

इत्यादिरीत्या छात्रेभ्यः पदानि निष्कास्य तानि फलके विलिख्य च मनोज्ञं चित्रं छात्रचित्तचक्षुषा पुरतः स्थापनीयम् । 'चन्द्रः, कृशप्रवाहा नदी' चेत्येतयोरन्तर्भाव उपरितने चित्रे न स्यात् । तदर्थं भिन्नं चित्रमपेक्ष्येत ।

साङ्घिकं वाचनम् । छात्रैरध्यापकमनु सर्वे श्लोकाः पठनीया गेया वा । एतत्पठनं छात्राणामतीव रुचिकरं चिरस्मृतिजनकं च भवति ।

एवं पाठादर्शे काव्याध्यापनरीतिर्दिङ्मात्रं प्रदर्शिता । अत्रैतत्तु न विस्मर्तव्यं यदध्यापनस्य चित्तरञ्जकत्वे हृदयहारित्वे वाऽध्यापकेन विहितपूर्वो रसज्ञवृत्तिसनाथः संस्कृतकाव्याभ्यासस्तदीयमुत्साहतादात्म्यादिसम्पन्नत्वं प्रत्युत्पन्नमतित्वं चैव प्रधानकारणम् । नाध्यापनपद्धतिविज्ञानमात्रं यशसे भवति ॥

—॥—

शब्दशक्तिग्रहः ।



अपरिचितभाषाध्यापने पाश्चात्यभाषातत्त्वविदः शब्दार्थज्ञापनं प्रायः (१) वस्तुचित्राभिनयदर्शनपूर्वकं तत्तद्भाषागतशब्दोच्चारेण (व्यवहारेण), (२) मातृभाषानुवादेन, (३) लक्षणपर्यायादिकथनेन, (४) वाक्यगतसन्दर्भेण चेति चतुर्धा विदधति । अत्रोत्तरोत्तरस्मात्पूर्वपूर्वः प्रकारः श्रेयान्, किन्तु बालाध्यापने प्रथम एव श्रेष्ठः । द्वितीयः प्रकारोऽन्येभ्योऽपि प्रथमस्य

निकटतरत्वं वर्ततेऽत्यतो मातृभाषोपयोगेऽपि द्रुतमिति. यद्रक कार्योऽध्यापकेन। तथापि यथासम्भवं संस्कृताध्यापने सुगमगीर्वाणभाषाव्यवहारो युक्तः शब्दार्थज्ञापने।

पौरस्त्यभाषातत्त्वविदश्च—

शक्तिग्रहं व्याकरणोपमानकोशाप्तवाक्याद् व्यवहारतश्च।
वाक्यस्य शेषाद्विवृतेर्वदन्ति सान्निध्यतः सिद्धपदस्य वृद्धाः॥

इति रीत्या शब्दार्थज्ञानप्रणालीमष्टविधां मन्यन्ते। तद्यथा—

(१) व्याकरणम्। अत्र पदपदार्थसम्बन्धज्ञानापरपर्याये शक्तिग्रहे व्याकरणमेव 'मुखं व्याकरणं स्मृतम्' इति शिक्षावचनानुसारेण मुख्यत्वेनाङ्गीकृतम्। धातुप्रकृतिप्रत्ययादिभिः पदरूपसिद्धिर्वाक्यगतपदानां च क्रियान्वयेन कारकज्ञापनं प्रयोगज्ञापनं चेति प्रमुखं प्रयोजनं व्याकरणस्य। किन्तु प्रकृतिप्रत्ययखण्डेन पदरूपसिद्धिं बालाध्ययनारम्भे दुःखजनकां विज्ञाय, पदविच्छेदनपूर्वकं यौगिकार्थज्ञापनं विहाय च, पदावयवशक्तिबोधापेक्षया पदसमुदायरूढिबोधनं प्रारम्भे सुगमतरं मन्यमानाः पूर्वतनसम्प्रदायिनः शाब्दिकवरेण्याः शब्दरूपावलिद्वारा सद्यः रूढार्थं बोधयता सिद्धपदरूपाण्येव शिष्यैः पाठनं श्रेयोवहमित्यवधारयन्। अत्र पन्था बालधीसम्पन्नगुरुः पाश्चात्यभाषातत्त्ववादी चेति विशेषतोऽत्र समवधेयम्। अपि च सुबन्तरूपप्रधानायाः समासबहुलायाश्च गीर्वाणभाषायाः प्रकृतिमनुसृत्य तिङन्तरूपपाठनादपि सुबन्तरूपपाठनमेव वरं, समासकारकप्रयोगज्ञानं भाषायां येन सुबन्तरूपज्ञानावश्यकं चेति सम्यङ् निर्णीय, शब्दरूपावलीसमासचक्रान्तर्गतं व्याकरणमेव वाङ्मयाध्ययनप्रविधानेन स्वीकृत्य मुख्यसिद्धिर्यत्र, पश्चात्तदाभ्यासाध्ययनानन्तरमेव सिद्धान्तकौमुद्यादिप्रमुखव्याकरणग्रन्थाध्ययनं श्रेय इति निश्चिन्वन् दाक्षिणात्याः शाब्दिकाः। 'सर्वत्र प्रथमं व्याकरणम्' इति वार्तिकानुसारेण 'शब्दो रूढः, पूर्वं रूढम्' च। अतो रूपज्ञानपूर्वं रूढमधिकृत्यैव दाक्षिणात्यानामध्यापनप्रणाली प्रचलिता।

किञ्च संहिताध्ययनादिकालादारभ्यैव पञ्चमहाकाव्यकारपर्यन्तसुप्रयोगैः गीर्वाणभाषा स्वकीयभाषारूपतामापन्ना परिदृश्य सुबन्तप्रधान

समासबहुला च सञ्जातेति स्वर्गीयश्रीभाण्डारकरमहोदयानामेव सिद्धान्तः[1]। एतत्परिवर्तनानुसारेणाध्यापनेऽपि व्याकरणस्य, तद्गतप्रकरणानां पूर्वोत्तरभावः सुबन्ततिङन्तक्रमेण शनैः शनैः परिवृत्त इत्यनुमीयते। भगवान् पतञ्जलिरात्मनः पूर्वं व्याकरणाध्ययनं कथं प्रचलितमित्यत्र विषये ब्रवीति। यथा—

"पुराकल्प एतदासीत्। संस्कारोत्तरकालं ब्राह्मणा व्याकरणं स्माधीयते। तेभ्यस्तत्तत्स्थानकरणनादानुप्रदानेभ्यो वैदिकाः शब्दा उपदिश्यन्ते। तदद्यत्वे न तथा। वेदमधीत्य त्वरिता वक्तारो भवन्ति 'वेदान्नो वैदिकाः शब्दाः सिद्धा लोकाच्च लौकिकाः। अनर्थकं व्याकरणम्' इति। तेभ्य एव विप्रतिपन्नबुद्धिभ्योऽध्येतृभ्यः सुहृद् भूत्वाऽऽचार्यः (पाणिनिः) इदं शास्त्रमन्वाचष्टे" इति।

आ पतञ्जलेर्भूरिकालं यावत्पाणिन्यष्टाध्यायीक्रमेणैवादौ सूत्रपठनं तदनु काशिकाध्ययनं तदुत्तरं च पातञ्जलमहाभाष्याध्ययनमित्ययं क्रमः स्थूलतः प्रवृत्तः, यतः पाणिनेः पूर्वस्मात्कालादारभ्य पतञ्जलिपर्यन्तं तदूर्ध्वमपि गीर्वाणभाषाया भाष्यमाणत्वाद् बालेर्शैशवपूर्वत्वाच्च बाल्य एव 'रक्षोहागमलघ्वसन्देहार्थं' व्याकरणपठनं भाषामुखेनैव प्राचलदिति निश्चीयते। काशिकायाः समकालिकाद् व्याकरणनियमोदाहरणपराद्भट्टिकाव्यात्तदनुवर्तिभ्यश्च काव्येभ्यः—यथा भौमककृतरावणार्जुनीयं, हलायुधविरचितकविरहस्यं, हेमचन्द्रनिर्मितं द्व्याश्रयकाव्यम्—इत्यादिभ्योऽवधार्यते यल्लक्ष्यलक्षणयोः (वाङ्मयव्याकरणयोः) अध्ययनमेकसमयावच्छेदेनैव प्रस्तुतमासीच्च तु व्याकरणपूर्वकमिति। व्याकरणाध्यापनेऽपि पाणिनिसूत्रक्रम उत्तरोत्तरं भाषापरिवर्तनानुरोधेन बालबोधसौकर्यानुरोधेन चादौ सुबन्तप्रकरणं पश्चात्तिङन्तप्रकरणमित्यानुपूर्व्या परिणतिं गत इत्यत्र विषये कातन्त्रसारस्वतमुग्धबोधादिसुगमव्याकरणानि, तत्पश्चाद्वा विपु पाणिनीयमतानुसारिग्रन्थेपु च विमलसरस्वतिकृता रूपमाला, रामचन्द्रनिर्मिता प्रक्रियाकौमुदी, भट्टोजिदीक्षितविरचिता सिद्धान्तकौमुदी चेति ग्रन्थाः सन्ति विशिष्टानि निदर्शनानि। सारस्वतसद्महादिका अन्येऽपि बहवो बालोपयोगिनो ग्रन्था सुबन्तकारकसमा-

---

[1] Read 'Wilson Philological Lectures', Chapter I. p. 24. (Edition-1914)

सवद्धितातिङ्कृदादिक्रममेव पुरस्कृत्य बहुभिर्जनैर्विरचिता.। इयं प्रवृत्तिरेत-देव साधयति यत्तिङन्तरूपपाठनात्प्रागेव सुबन्तरूपपाठन भाषास्वरूपानुसारेण प्रभूतोपयुक्तम्। शास्त्रिभिरनुसृत बालानां शब्दरूपावलिसमासचक्रपाठन-मस्या एव प्रवृत्तेः प्रमाणम्।

वाङ्मयावबोधे वाक्यार्थः कारकप्रयोगज्ञानमवलम्बते, कारकप्रयोग-ज्ञान तिङन्तरूपावलम्बि चेति सत्यम्। किन्तु तदर्थे सविस्तरा क्रियापदरूप-साधनिका सामान्यच्छात्राणां नापेक्षिता, स्थूलक्रियापदज्ञान पर्याप्तमिति निपुण विचार्य केचिच्छास्त्रिवरा अध्ययनारम्भे शब्दरूपावलीपाठनादनन्तर छात्रान् धातुरूपावलीद्वारा सिद्धतिङन्तरूपाण्येव पाठयन्ति, न तु रूपसाध-निकायामभिनिविशन्ते। विशेषतोऽत्र ज्ञातव्यं यत्र सर्वेऽपि शास्त्रिणः पूर्वं वैयाकरणा अभवन्। ते रूपावलीसमासचक्रगतेन व्याकरणमात्रेण वाङ्मय-मधीत्य न्यायादिशास्त्रमाध्ययनरतास्तस्मिंस्तस्मिन्नेव शास्त्रे प्रगाढपाण्डित्य-मलभन्त। इयं पूर्वतनी स्थितिः सविशेषं चित्तगोचरीकार्या भाषापरिचयं विना, वाङ्मयाध्ययन विनापि बहुकाल यावत्क्रियापदरूपसाधनिकायामेव च्छात्रबुद्धिं क्लेशयद्भिराङ्ग्लपाठशालाध्यापकैः।

(२) उपमानम्। गोसदृशो गवयपदवाच्य इति सादृश्यज्ञानमिव परिचितवस्तुपदादिसादृश्येनापरिचितवस्तुपदादिपरिचय उपमानम्। निखिलै-र्दार्शनिकैरुरीकृतमप्येतदुपमानप्रमाणमाह्लादकारिणा साधर्म्येण काव्यश्री-वर्धनपरं विषयावबोधप्ररोचनपरमित्यालङ्कारिकाणां सविशेषं शिरोधार्यम्। अतः साहित्यानुरागिणां शास्त्रिवराणां प्रचुरोपमानप्रमाणपुरःसरमध्यापनमपि शिष्याणां मनोविनोदजनकं भवति।

(३) कोशः। कोशादपि शक्तिग्रहो भवतीत्यतः शास्त्रिवराश्छात्रे-रमरादिकोशगतानुपयुक्तपर्यायबहुलान् विशिष्टभागान् पाठयन्ति, ये भागा-श्छात्रप्रयुक्तिविरुद्ध सवर्षं काव्याध्ययनकाले प्रभूतोपयोगिनः। किन्त्वत्रापि वाक्यसन्दर्भेऽबोधपूर्व विहितमेतदध्ययनं क्लेशोत्पादनात्प्रारम्भे विफलं, सञ्जाते वाङ्मयाध्ययने सफलमित्यनुभवमाश्रित्य किञ्चिद्वाङ्मयाध्ययना-नन्तरमेवारम्भणीयमिति भाति।

(४) आप्तवाक्यम्। आप्तवाक्यादपि शक्तिग्रहो यथा 'कोकिलः पिकशब्दवाच्य' इति गीर्वाणशब्दप्रमाणपुरःसर परिचितपदैः समपरिचित-

पदबोधो विधीयते। आप्तो यथार्थवक्ता यथाभूतस्याबाधितार्थस्योपदेष्टा वेति कल्पनाया पुरस्कृतायामध्यापकोऽप्यत्राऽऽप्तो भवितुमर्हति।

(५) व्यवहारः। लोकव्यवहारसामान्येनापि शक्तिग्रहो भवतीति पूर्वतनप्राच्यदार्शनिकैरेव समुद्भावितं भाषाभ्यासतत्त्वम्। अत्र विषये न्यायसिद्धान्तमुक्तावल्यामुक्तं यत्—

"यथा प्रयोजकवृद्धेन (गुरुणा वा) घटमानयेत्युक्तम्। तच्छ्रुत्वा प्रयोज्यवृद्धेन (अन्येन गुरुणा शिष्येण वा) घट आनीतः। तदवधार्य पार्श्वस्थो बालो घटानयनरूपं कार्यं 'घटमानय' इति शब्दप्रयोज्यमित्यवधारयति। ततश्च 'घटं नय, गामानय' इत्यादावावापोद्वापाभ्यां *(अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां)* घटादिपदानां कार्यान्वितघटादौ शक्तिं गृह्णाति" इति।

न्यायसिद्धान्तमञ्जर्यामप्ययमेव विषयो विस्तरेणोक्तः। यथा—

"*प्रथमतः शक्तिग्रहो व्यवहाराद् घटानयनादिरूपाद्भवति। तथा* हि 'घटमानय' इति केनचित्प्रयोजकवृद्धेन नियुक्तः कश्चन प्रयोज्यवृद्धस्तद्वाक्यतोऽर्थं प्रतीत्य घटमानयति। तच्चोपलभमानो बालस्तया क्रियया तस्य प्रयोज्यस्य प्रयत्नमनुमिनोति। तेन च घटानयनगोचरप्रयत्नेन तस्य ज्ञानं घटानयनगोचरमनुमिनोति। स्वप्रयत्ने तेन तथा निश्चयात्। ततस्तद्धेत्वाकाङ्क्षायामुपस्थितत्वाच्छब्दमेव कल्पयति। तदनन्तरं घटादिपदानां प्रत्येकमावापोद्वापाभ्यां घटपदं घटधीजनकमिति कल्पयति। क्लृप्ते च तस्मिन्नतिप्रसङ्गभङ्गाय तज्जननानुकूलसङ्केतरूपं सम्बन्धं कल्पयति। अप्रातिप्रसङ्गस्तु घटपदं घटधीजनकमिव पटधीजनकमपि स्यादिति अगृहीतशक्तिकानामपि घटबोधः स्यादिति वा बोध्यः। तत आद्यशक्तिग्रहानन्तरमुपमानादिभिः शक्तिग्रहो भवति" इति।

अत्र घटानयनकार्योपलम्भः, आनयनप्रयत्नानुमानम्, स्वप्रयत्नस्मरणपुरस्सरं निश्चयः, शब्दार्थयोः प्रकल्पनम्, अन्वयव्यतिरेकज्ञानेन प्रतिपदार्थाध्यवसायः, अनुकूलसङ्केतकल्पनं चेति पार्श्वस्थबालस्य सकलोऽपि मानसिको व्यापारः आधुनिकमनोविज्ञानवर्णितस्य मानसिकव्यापारस्य सुतरां सादृश्यं वहतीति चेतश्चमत्कारजनकम्। पाश्चात्यानां सवादपद्धति-

रप्यमुमेव मानसिकव्यापारमधिष्ठाय बालानां भाषाध्यापने प्ररोचनावर्धन-पुरस्सरं प्रचलन्तीति सुविज्ञात भवेन्मर्मज्ञैः। अत इयं पद्धतिः माध्यदार्थं-निकानुयायिन्येवेति निश्चित्य संस्कृताध्यापकैरियं भाषाध्यापने संस्कृत-वाग्व्यवहाररूपेणाङ्गीकार्या।

काव्यप्रकाशेऽप्यमुमेव विषयं प्रकारान्तरेण प्रतिपाद्य मीमांसैक-देशिनामन्विताभिधानवादिनामेवैतन्मतमिति युक्तम्। यथा—

"'देवदत्त, गामानय' इत्युत्तमवृद्धवाक्यप्रयोगाद्देशाद्देशान्तरं सास्नादिमन्तमर्थं मध्यमवृद्धे नयति सति 'अनेनास्माद्वाक्यादेवंविधोऽर्थः प्रतिपन्नः' इति तच्चेष्टयानुमाय, तयोरखण्डवाक्यवाक्यार्थयोरर्थापत्त्या वाच्यवाचकभावलक्षणं सम्बन्धमवधार्य बालस्तत्र व्युत्पद्यते। परतः 'चैत्र, गामानय। देवदत्त, अश्वमानय। देवदत्त, गां नय' इत्यादिवाक्यप्रयोगे तस्य तस्य शब्दस्य तं तमर्थमवधारयतीति अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां प्रवृत्ति-निवृत्तिकारि वाक्यमेव प्रयोगयोग्यमिति वाक्यस्थितानामेव पदानाम-न्वितैः पदार्थैरन्वितानामेव सङ्केतो गृह्यत इति विशिष्टा एव पदार्था वाक्यार्थः। न तु पदार्थानां वैशिष्ट्यम्। यद्यपि वाक्यान्तर-प्रयुज्यमानान्यपि प्रत्यभिज्ञाप्रत्ययेन तान्येवैतानि पदानि निश्चीयन्त इति पदार्थान्तरमात्रेणान्वितः पदार्थः सङ्केतगोचरस्तथापि सामान्यावच्छादितो विशेषरूप एवासौ प्रतिपद्यते, व्यतिषक्तानां पदार्थानां तथाभूतत्वादि-त्यन्विताभिधानवादिनः" इति।

अयमेव मानसतत्त्वावलम्बी प्राच्यानां सिद्धान्तः पाश्चात्त्यानां संवाद-पद्धतौ प्रथमत्वमधिगम्य वस्तुनिर्देशाभिनयदर्शनपूर्वकं तत्तद्वाचकनूतनपद-पाठने भाषायाः प्रत्यक्षव्यवहारे च पर्यवस्यति। पाश्चात्त्यभाषातत्त्वविदोऽ-प्यन्विताभिधानवादिन इव वाक्यवादिनः, न त्वभिहितान्वयवादिन इव पदवादिनः।

मानसिकस्याप्यस्यार्थस्यैव व्यवहारप्रयोगेण प्रत्युपगादिवशाद्वा शब्दार्थयोः सिद्धः (नियतः) सम्बन्धो वर्तते इत्यभिप्रेत्य शब्दस्य बहिर्निर्गमनव्यापारविवरणे, तथा च व्यवहारतो जाते शक्तिग्रहे, घटपट-

मानमानसव्यापारविषये च दुर्गाचार्यो 'व्याप्तिमत्त्वात्तु शब्दस्य' (निरुक्त १।२।४) इति निरुक्तपङ्क्तिं व्याचिख्यासुर्ब्रूते । यथा—

"कथं पुनर्व्याप्तिमान् शब्द इति ? शृणु–शरीरे ह्यभिधानाभिधेयरूपा बुद्धिर्हृदयान्तर्गताकाशप्रतिष्ठिता । तयोरभिधानरूपाभिधेयरूपयोर्बुद्ध्योर्मध्येऽभिधानरूपया शास्त्राभिमतप्रयोजनविजिज्ञापयिषया बुद्ध्या पुरुषेण तदभिव्यक्तिसमर्थेन स्वगुणभूतेन प्रयत्नेनोदीर्यमाणः शब्द उरःकण्ठादिवर्णस्थानेषु निष्पद्यमानस्तथा पुरुषार्थाभिधानसमर्थवर्णादिभावमापद्यमानः पुरुषप्रयत्नेन बहिर्विनिक्षिप्तोऽविनाशिनि व्यक्तिभावमापन्नः श्रोत्रद्वारेणानुप्रविश्य प्रत्याय्यस्य बुद्धिं सर्वार्थरूपां सर्वाभिधानरूपां व्याप्नोतीत्येवं व्याप्तिमाञ्छब्दः । ......स शब्दः स्वमर्थमभिदधत् स्वक्रियाप्रवेशोपजनितेनाभिधानेनाख्यातमित्येवमादिना स्वमात्मानमभिसम्बध्य तिरोभवितुमुपक्रमते, विनाशं चोपैति । ...... पुरुषप्रयत्नोपजनिताद् वक्त्रोद्घातात्परस्यार्थे प्रत्ययमाधाय शब्दव्यक्तय एव ध्वंसन्ते, न तु शब्दाकृतयः । तास्तु तयाभिधानशक्त्या बुद्धिद्वारेणावस्थिता. स्वानर्थान् प्रकाशयन्त्य. स्थिता एव भवन्ति ।" इति ॥

मनस उद्बुद्धत्वानुद्बुद्धत्वे प्रतिपादयत आधुनिकमनोविज्ञानान्न किञ्चिदप्युपरितन प्रतिपादनं भिद्यत इत्यालोच्य विस्मीयेत कस्यापि चेतः ।

अपि च सवादपद्धतिगत शब्दसङ्कृतं यद्वस्तुचित्राभिनयादिदर्शनं तस्योपयोगः परिमितत्वं चेति विषये महर्षियास्कवचनं यथा–'अणीयस्त्वाच्च शब्देन संज्ञाकरणं व्यवहारार्थं लोके' (१।२।५)। अत्र दुर्गाचार्यो व्याख्याति यथा– "अभिनया अपि व्याप्तिमन्तः पाणिविहाराक्षिनिकोचादयः ।..... न त्वणीयांसः, ते महता यत्नेन व्याप्नुवन्ति, न च निःसन्दिग्धं कुर्वन्ति । तत्प्रतीतार्थसम्बन्धस्यैव, नेतरस्य । शब्दस्त्वपरिमितमर्थमल्पीयसा यत्नेनोच्चारितो व्याप्नोति । तस्मादणीयस्त्वादिति विशेषहेतूपपत्त्या शब्देनैव संज्ञाकरणं लोके इत्युपपन्नम्" इति ।

व्यवहारेऽभिनयादीनामर्थवाचकत्वमत्राभ्युपगम्यते । किन्तु शब्दसङ्कृता एवाभिनयादयो निःसन्दिग्धबोधे समर्थाः, शब्दस्य व्याप्तिमत्त्वादणीयस्त्वाच्चेति यास्कदुर्गवचनाशयः । तस्माच्छब्दशक्तिग्रहे वस्तुचित्राभिनयदर्शनस्य

न तद्वच्छब्दान्प्रयुयुक्षमाणो वैयाकरणकुलं गत्वाऽऽह–कुरु शब्दान् प्रयोक्ष्य इति। तावत्येवार्थमुपादाय शब्दान्प्रयुङ्क्ते। यदि तर्हि लोक एव प्रमाणं, किं शास्त्रेण क्रियते? लोकतोऽर्थप्रयुक्ते शब्दप्रयोगे शास्त्रेण धर्मनियमः क्रियते।" (पातञ्जलमहाभाष्ये पस्पशाह्निकम्)

पतञ्जलेः समये संस्कृतभाषाव्यवहारपूर्वकमेव व्याकरणशास्त्राध्ययनं प्रचलितमासीदिति सुव्यक्तं प्रतीयते। अत एवाधुनापि संस्कृताध्यापकैर्भाषाव्यवहारपूर्वकं व्याकरणमध्यापनीयमित्यत्र भावः। आदौ भाषाऽनन्तरं व्याकरणमिति न्यायेन लोकव्यवहारसामान्यादर्थप्रयुक्ते शब्दप्रयोग एव धर्मनियमं कुर्वतो व्याकरणशास्त्रस्याध्यापनं श्रेय इत्ययं भाषाधिगमस्य नैसर्गिकः क्रमः प्राच्यप्रतीच्यभाषातत्त्वविदां परमसमतः। अत इदानीमपि संस्कृताध्यापनेऽयं क्रमः परिपालनीय इत्याकूतम्। नूतनभाषाध्ययने पुनर्भाषाव्यवहारं परित्यज्य सर्वत्रापि मातृभाषानुवादपद्धतिरेवोपयोक्तव्येति स्याच्चेत्कस्यापि मिथ्याग्रहस्तर्हि स कथयतु,–संस्कृतमूलग्रन्थव्याख्यानपराः सर्वेऽपि टीकाग्रन्थाः संस्कृतभाषायामेव किमर्थं विरचिता इति।

(६) वाक्यशेषः। प्रकृतार्थस्य सन्देहे वाक्यशेषात्प्रमाणभूतवाक्यान्तराद्वा विशिष्टशब्दार्थोऽवधार्यते। यथा–'अक्ता: शर्कराः (मृत्तिकामिश्राः क्षुद्रपाषाणाः) उपदधाति' इत्यत्र 'शर्कराः केनाङ्क्तव्याः' इति प्राप्ते सन्देहे 'तेजो वै घृतम्' इति वाक्यशेषात् 'शर्करा घृतेनाङ्क्तव्याः, न तु तैलादिना' इत्यर्थो निर्धार्यते। 'येन पदेनानुक्तेन वाक्यं समाप्येत स वाक्यशेषः' वा (सुश्रुतसंहिता, उत्तरतन्त्रम्, अ. ६५)। अयं वाक्यशेषो मीमांसकानां विशिष्टार्थनिर्धारणरीतिं प्रकटयति।

(७) विवृतिः। "विवरणादपि शक्तिग्रहः। विवरणं तु तत्समानार्थकपदान्तरेण तदर्थकथनम्। यथा घटोऽस्तीत्यस्य कलशोऽस्तीत्यनेन विवरणाद् घटपदस्य कलशे शक्तिग्रहः। एवं पचतीत्यस्य पाकं करोतीत्यनेन विवरणादाख्यातस्य यत्नार्थकत्वं कल्प्यते।" (न्यायसिद्धान्तमुक्तावलिः)

एषा विवृतिष्टीकाविवरणव्याख्याव्याख्यानाद्यपरपर्याया यथा मुखतस्तथा ग्रन्थतोऽपि विधातुं शक्यते। "मूलग्रन्थस्याप्रतिपत्तिविप्रतिपत्त्यन्यथाप्रतिपत्तिनिवारणेन तत्कर्तुरभिप्रेतस्य शब्दान्तरेण विवरणं टीका"

(न्यायकोशः)। 'यथासम्भवमर्थस्य टीकनं' वा टीका (काव्यमीमांसा)। अयं सामान्यवाची टीकाशब्दः 'टीकते गमयति बोधयति प्रकाशयति वाऽर्थम्' इति धात्वर्थात्सिध्यति। याऽर्थं विवृणोति व्यनक्ति प्रकाशयति स्फोटयति सा विवृतिर्विवरणं वा। सूत्रतो ग्रन्थतो वा तत्स्थानार्थकपदान्तरेण विशेषेण विस्तरेण यदाख्यानं कथनं तद् व्याख्यानम्। 'अतिशयवर्णना व्याख्यानं' वा (कौ. अर्थशास्त्रम्, १५।१५०)। उक्तं च 'व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्न हि सन्देहादलक्षणम्' इति। तथा च "न केवलं चर्चापदानि व्याख्यानम्-वृद्धिः-आत्-ऐच्-इति। किं तर्हि? उदाहरणं प्रत्युदाहरणं वाक्याध्याहार इत्येतत्समुदितं व्याख्यानं भवति। अविजानत एतदेवं भवति" इति (व्या. महाभाष्यम्, प्रथमाह्निकम्)। व्याख्यानस्य पराशरपुराणे लक्षणं यथा—

पदच्छेदः पदार्थोक्तिर्विग्रहो वाक्ययोजना।
आक्षेपोऽथ समाधानं व्याख्यानं पञ्चलक्षणम्॥ इति।

विवरणव्याख्यानादीनामन्येऽपि तदर्थवाचिनः 'प्रवचनादयः' पर्यायाष्टीकाग्रन्थनामकरणायोपयुज्यन्ते, किन्तु सर्वमप्येतद्विधं वाङ्मयं सामान्यवाचिना टीकापदेनैव व्यवह्रियते।

टीकाया वृत्तिपद्धतिभाष्यसमीक्षाचूर्णिपञ्जिकाकारिकावार्तिकस्तबकप्रस्तावादयोऽन्येऽपि भेदाः। तेषां लक्षणानि यथा—

"सूत्राणां सकलसारविवरणं वृत्तिः। सूत्रवृत्तिविवेचनं पद्धतिः। आक्षिप्य भाषणाद्भाष्यम्। अन्तर्भाष्यं समीक्षा। अवान्तरार्थविच्छेदश्च सा (समीक्षा चूर्णिर्वा)। विषमपदभञ्जिका पञ्जिका। अर्थप्रदर्शनकारिका कारिका। उक्तानुक्तदुरुक्तचिन्ता वार्तिकमिति शास्त्रभेदाः।" (काव्यमीमांसा)

यत्र सूत्राणां समस्तानामर्थस्य यद् व्याख्यानं सा वृत्तिः। सूत्रस्य वृत्तेश्च तात्पर्यं विविच्य यस्यामितिकर्तव्यतानुक्रमः कथ्यते सा पद्धतिः। पूर्वपक्षखण्डनपूर्वकमुत्तरपक्षेण सिद्धान्तकथनं भाष्यम्।

सूत्रार्थो वर्ण्यते येन पदैः सूत्रानुसारिभिः।
स्वपदानि च वर्ण्यन्ते भाष्यं भाष्यविदो विदुः॥

इत्यपि भाष्यलक्षणम्। मध्येभाष्य यो विमर्शस्तस्य सङ्कलनेन सम्यगीक्षणं समीक्षा। सा समीक्षा प्रधानान्तर्वर्तिनोऽवान्तरार्थस्य पृथक्करणम्। 'अवान्तरार्थविच्छेदश्च सा चूर्णिः' इति गृहीते पाठे, या चूर्णयति खण्डयति पूर्वपक्षिणामवान्तरार्थरूपं दुस्तर्कं सा चूर्णिर्महाभाष्य वेत्यर्थः समुदेति। विषमाणां दुरूहाणां पदानां भञ्जिका अर्थविस्फारिका पञ्जिका। छन्दोरूपेण या सूत्रार्थं प्रदर्शयति सा कारिका। सूत्रकृता येऽर्था उक्ताः, अनवधानतोऽनुक्ता दुरुक्ताश्च तेषां चिन्ता विमर्शो यत्र तद् वार्तिकम्।

उक्तानुक्तदुरुक्तानां चिन्ता यत्र प्रवर्तते।
तं ग्रन्थं वार्तिकं प्राहुर्वार्तिकज्ञा मनीषिणः॥

इत्यपि पराशरपुराणे वार्तिकलक्षणम्। सङ्ग्रहलक्षणं यथा—

विस्तरेणोपदिष्टानामर्थानां सूत्रभाष्ययोः।
निबन्धो यः समासेन सङ्ग्रहं तं विदुर्बुधाः॥ इति।

सर्वेऽप्येते टीकाभेदाः शास्त्रभेदा इति मत्वा टीकाशब्दो राजशेखरेण शास्त्रपर्यायवाची गृह्यते। शिष्यतेऽनेनेति, शास्ति च त्रायते चेति वा शास्त्रमिति व्युत्पादनेन शास्त्रमत्र ज्ञानस्य नियमनं व्यवस्थापनं शिष्यबुद्ध्यनुसारेण च यथाक्रमं सम्यगवबोधनं मुखतो ग्रन्थतोऽध्यापनं वेत्यर्थमवगमयति। शास्त्रशब्दोऽत्र न केवलं विशिष्टसम्प्रदायवाची किन्तु षड्दर्शनवाची वैदिकावैदिकसर्वदर्शनसङ्ग्राहकश्च ग्राह्यः, सर्वेष्वपि यथाशक्ति ज्ञानव्यवस्थितिसामान्यत्वात्। विविधैष्टीकाभेदैरेव संस्कृतवाङ्मयं तद्गतेन शास्त्रजातेन सह सुविस्तृतिमापन्नमित्यतः संस्कृतवाङ्मयस्याऽऽस्त्यटीकासङ्कुलत्व शास्त्रभूयिष्ठत्व वेति व्यवच्छेदो भवति। भाषाया उत्तरोत्तरं परिवृत्तिस्तदनुरोधेनोत्तरकालीनैर्जनैः पूर्वकालीनग्रन्थानामनवगम एव टीकावाङ्मयविवृद्धेर्मूलम्। अपि च गुरुमुखपरम्परयाऽऽगतं ज्ञानं कदाचित्काल देशदोषतः क्षीणत्वं प्राप्नोति, खण्डितं वा भवतीत्यतो निगूढाशयविशदीकरणार्थमविरतसन्तानार्थं चापि तज्ज्ञानं टीकाग्रन्थेष्वक्षरसन्निविष्टं क्रियत इत्यन्यदपि टीकाग्रन्थानां बीजम्। मूलग्रन्थापेक्षया तद्विवरणं जटिलतरमिति स्थितौ टीकायाष्टीका अपि टिप्पनीरूपेण प्रचुरतया लिखिताः सन्ति संस्कृतवाङ्मये। किन्तु क्वचिदेतद्दोषदुष्टमपि टीकावाङ्मयं प्रायो

मूलार्थस्य समीचीनबोधं कुर्वदास्त इत्युक्तौ न स्यात्प्रत्यवायः। ज्ञानव्यवस्थिति-पदवाच्ये शास्त्रे पदवाक्यप्रमाणपराणि यानि भाषातत्त्वान्युपयुज्यन्ते, यानि च तेषु तेषु टीकाग्रन्थेष्वपि सामान्यतोऽनुसृतानि तानि निखिलवैदिकावैदिक-दार्शनिकानां प्रायः सम्मतानि। एतेषां टीकादिगतानां समानभाषातत्त्वानां सद्ग्रथनं व्यवस्थापनं वा पाश्चात्यैः 'Methodology' (पद्धतिविज्ञानम्, व्यवस्थितिशास्त्रम्) इत्यभिधीयते। एतत्पद्धतिविज्ञानं व्यवस्थितिशास्त्रं वा प्राचीनभारते प्रभिन्नशास्त्रद्वारा परिणतेः परां कोटिं गतम्। तथापि प्रभिन्न-प्रस्थानेष्वपि समानभाषातत्त्वावलम्बविषयेऽविसंवाद एव वर्तते। प्रस्थानभेद-मनुसरतामपि टीकाग्रन्थानामर्थविवृतिपरिपाटीषु भेदतोऽपि साधर्म्यमेव नयनसरणिमायाति। अत्र—

प्रभिन्ने प्रस्थाने परमिदमदः पथ्यमिति च।
रुचीनां वैचित्र्यादृजुकुटिलनानापथजुषा।

नृणां शब्दतत्त्वावलम्बी सूत्रभाष्यटीकामार्ग एक एव गम्य इति सुव्यक्तम्।

शब्दतत्त्वमाश्रित्य विशिष्टशास्त्रटीकालेखने यानि पदवाक्यप्रमाण-पराणि सामान्यतत्त्वानि सन्दृब्धानि, यानि पुरतः संस्थाप्य च प्रभिन्नटीका-ग्रन्थविरचनं पूर्वस्मिन् काले जातं, तानि सर्वाण्यपि विविधमौखिकाध्यापन-रीतीनां निदर्शनानीत्यनुमातुं शक्यते। यतो भारतीयानां मौखिकाध्यापने यावती श्रद्धा न तावती लिखितपठने। विशेषतो वेदाध्ययने—

गीती शीघ्री शिरःकम्पी तथा लिखितपाठकः।
अनर्थज्ञोऽल्पकण्ठश्च षडेते पाठकाधमाः॥

इति वेदाङ्गशिक्षाप्रमाणाल्लिखितपाठकस्याधमत्वं, मौखिकाध्यापने गुरुमुखे वा भारतीयानां प्रभूतादरश्च प्राचीनकालात्प्रभृत्यद्य यावद् दृश्येते। किन्तु गुरुमुखं वरं, लिखितवाङ्मयं चावरमिति सन्दृश्य भारतीयैर्मौखिका-ध्यापने विषयावबोधनरीत्यां च यानि यानि तत्त्वान्यनुसृतानि तानि तान्येव शास्त्रटीकाग्रन्थरूपेण चिरस्थायित्वं प्रापितानीति टीकाग्रन्थगतप्रमाणैरेव निर्णेतुं शक्यम्।

पुरा प्रतिगृहं पिता पुत्रं गुरुः शिष्यं वा मुखतोऽध्यापयति स्म। एवमध्यापनस्य मौखिकत्वसामान्येऽपि प्रतिगुरु प्रभिन्नाऽध्यापनरीतिः

स्यादिति प्रतीयते। किन्त्वेतादृशानां विद्वदध्यापकानां सत्रप्रसङ्गेनान्यकारणवशाद्वा मुहुर्मुहुर्बभूवुः सम्मेलनानि, यानि परिषत्पर्षत्ससत्समित्यादिसंज्ञाभिः सूत्रस्मृतिग्रन्थेषु निर्दिष्टानि। ईदृशीषु परिषत्सु विविधविषयानधिकृत्य ये संवादविवादाः समजायन्त, तेष्वर्थनिर्धारणरीतिविषयमप्यन्तर्भाव्य पदज्ञापकं व्याकरणशास्त्रं, वाक्यज्ञापकं मीमांसाशास्त्रं, प्रमाणज्ञापकं न्यायशास्त्रमिति शब्दनिष्ठं शास्त्रत्रयमधिकृत्य केचिन्निर्णयाः कृताः स्युर्ये सकलाभिमतत्वेन पुनरपि वैयक्तिकाध्यापने समाश्रिता भवेयुः। यतश्चरकसंहितायां परिषद्गतसंवादविवादरीतिमुद्दिश्योपरितनशास्त्रत्रयसम्बन्धसूचकः सम्भाषाविधयः (चरक. विमान. ८), चरकसुश्रुतकौटिलीयार्थशास्त्रग्रन्थेषु चार्थनिर्धारणपद्धतिमधिकृत्य सर्वशास्त्रव्यापकास्तन्त्रयुक्तयः सङ्कलिताः सन्ति (चरक. सिद्धि., अ १२, सुश्रुत. उत्तरतन्त्रम्, अ. ६५; कौ. अर्थशास्त्रम्, १५।१५०)। सकलविद्वन्निर्णयपुरःसरं प्रतिष्ठापितेयं मौखिकाध्यापनरीतिरेव भूरिकालादनन्तरं टीकाग्रन्थेषु निविष्टेत्यनुमीयते। अतः पुरातनाध्यापनरीतीनां यथार्थज्ञानं टीकाग्रन्थाध्ययनादृते नोपलभ्येतेति विमृश्य, टीकाग्रन्थगतानामध्यापनतत्त्वानां भाषातत्त्वानां च कालक्रमानुरोधेनोत्तरोत्तरं कथं परिणतिः सञ्जातेति गवेषणपुरस्सरमत्रोपन्यस्यते।

प्राचीनतमे काले संहितीकरणात्प्राग्वेदानामलिखितत्वात्प्रतिवैदिककुलं पृथक्पृथगेव कुलक्रमागतानां श्रुतिमन्त्राणां गुरुमुखतः श्रवणं 'पच्छोऽर्धर्चशः सर्वाम्' (आश्व. सू. १।२१।४–६) इति रीत्या—

> गुरुः शिष्यस्य पदमाह मुख्यं समासश्चेद्समासो यदि द्वे।
> एतेन कल्पेन समाप्य प्रश्नं प्रत्याम्नायमुक्त्वा पुनरेव सर्वे॥
>
> —(ऋक्प्रातिशाख्यम्, १५।१)

इति प्रकारेण वा व्यष्टिशः सङ्घशश्च गुरुमनु पठनं कण्ठस्थीकरणं चेति वाक्यशुद्धिकारि, भाषाधिगमोपकारि मन्त्रद्वयं मुखपरम्परयैव बहुकालं यावदध्ययनाध्यापनयोः प्रचलितम्। मुखपठनपूर्वकमेव भाषाध्ययनं श्रेय इत्यधुनातनभाषातत्त्वविदां मतमत्र संस्मरणीयम्। वेदभाषायास्तदानीं भाष्यमाणत्वादेतत्पठनं मन्त्रतः स्वरतो वर्णतो वाऽनपराध्य बोधपूर्वमेव बभूव। मन्त्रगतानां पुराणेतिहासादिनिर्देशानां प्रपूरणं छन्दोज्ञापनं च गुरवः शिष्याणां

सम्यग्बोधाय मुखत एव चक्रुः। एतदेवार्थविवृतेः प्रथमं रूपम्। अस्या अर्थविवृतेर्निदर्शनं यजुर्वेदान्तर्गता गद्यविभागा एव, ये ब्राह्मणग्रन्थानां पूर्वरूपं प्रदर्शयन्ति। वैदिकानां परिषत्सु संमिलितासु प्रतिवेदं मन्त्राणां संहितीकरणं क्रमशः सञ्जातम्। होतोद्गात्राऽध्वर्युर्ब्रह्मा चेत्येतेषां वेदचतुष्टय-पुरोहितानां यज्ञकर्मार्थं मिलिताभिः परिषद्भिः, प्रतिपुरोहितं कृतैर्मन्त्रविनि-योगैश्च वेदचतुष्टयं सर्वेषामपि वैदिकानां साधारणं पैतृकधनं सम्बभूव। वेदानां संहितीकरणसमयेऽक्षरलेखनप्रचारः प्रादुर्भूतः स्यादन्यथा संहिती-करणमसम्भवमिति भाति। एवं लेखनात्पूर्वं श्रवणं मौखिकावर्तनं चेति सर्वसंमतौ भाषाभ्यासतत्त्वावलम्बी क्रमो मौखिकाध्यापनविधिरिह भारतवर्षे निसर्गत एवोद्भूत इति सन्दर्शयेत। किन्तु लेखनसत्त्वे ग्रन्थसत्त्वे चापि वैदि-कानां मुखपाठे प्रवचने चैवान्यादृशी श्रद्धा न कदाचिन्न्यूनत्वं गता।

यथा यथा वेदभाषा परिवर्तनमाप तथा तथैव वेदरक्षितानाम-परिचितपदानां दुरूहमन्त्राणां चार्थविवृतिरपि गुरूणां कर्तव्यत्वेनापपात। ज्ञानेश्वरकालीनाया महाराष्ट्रभाषाया बोधो यथाऽऽधुनिकमहाराष्ट्रियाणां विना कोशमसुकरस्तथैवायं प्रकारो बभूव। गुरुभिर्येषामपरिचितवैदिकपदानां मुखतो निर्वचनमर्थविवृतिर्वा कार्या ते निघण्टुग्रन्थे पर्यायवर्गक्रमेण निरुक्ति-विकला एव सङ्गृह्यमाना उत्तरोत्तर परिववृधिरे। वेदभाषायाः परिवर्तनं तद्व्याख्यानरूपेषु ब्राह्मणग्रन्थेष्वेव दृश्यते। येषां पुराणेतिहासादीनां मन्त्र-सन्दर्भाणां प्रपूरणं पूर्वमध्यापकैर्मुखतो विहितं तेऽर्थवादाद्युद्गमभूताः सर्वेऽपि लिखितरूपेण ब्राह्मणेषु सङ्ग्रथिता बभूवुः। यदपरिचितपदानां निर्वचनं दुरूहमन्त्राणां व्याख्यानं वा पूर्वं मुखतोऽभूत्तदपि लिखितरूपेण ब्राह्मणेषु कुत्रचिल्लक्ष्यते। गुरुकुले विद्वत्परिषत्सु च पूर्वं निर्वचनव्याख्यानसंवाद-विवादादिभिर्ये प्रगटकाः शिष्यादीनुद्दिश्य गुरुभिः प्रसङ्ग प्रोक्तास्ते प्रायो ब्राह्मणग्रन्थेष्वक्षरसंनिविष्टाः। अत्रैव पूर्वमीमांसाशास्त्राङ्कुरः संलक्ष्यते। यथा—

"ब्राह्मणमपि त्रिविधम्-विधिरूपम्, अर्थवादरूपं तदुभयविलक्षणं च। तत्र शब्दभावना विधिरिति भाट्टाः। नियोगो विधिरिति प्राभाकराः। इष्टसाधनता विधिरिति तार्किकादयः। सर्वो विधिरपि चतुर्विधः, उत्पत्त्य-धिकारविनियोगप्रयोगभेदात्। .... .प्राशस्त्यनिन्दान्यतरल्लक्षणया विधि-शेषभूतं वाक्यमर्थवादः। स च त्रिविधः। गुणवादोऽनुवादो भूतार्थवाद-

श्चेति।......विध्यर्थवादोभयविलक्षणं तु वेदान्तवाक्यम्।" (मधुसूदन-सरस्वतीकृतः 'प्रस्थानभेदः')

सर्वाण्येव ब्राह्मणानि मन्त्रविवरणव्याख्यानपराण्येवेत्यभिप्रायेण श्रीमच्छङ्कराचार्यो बृहदारण्यकोपनिषद्भाष्ये "इतिहास. पुराणं विद्या उपनिषदः श्लोकाः सूत्राण्यनुव्याख्यानानि व्याख्यानान्यस्यैवेतानि निश्वसितानि" (बृ. २।४।१०) इति वचनमुद्दिश्य प्राहुः। यथा—

"इतिहास इत्युर्वशीपूरूरवसो सवादादिः 'उर्वशी हाप्सराः (शत॰ ब्रा॰ ११–४–४–१) इत्यादि ब्राह्मणमेव। पुराणम् 'असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्' (तै. २।७) इत्यादि। विद्या देवजनविद्या (नृत्यगीतादि शास्त्रम्) 'वेदः सोऽयम्' (शत. १३–४–३।१०–१४) इत्याद्या। उपनिषदः 'प्रियमित्येतदुपासीत' (बृ. ४–१–३) इत्याद्याः। श्लोका ब्राह्मणप्रभवा मन्त्राः 'तदेते श्लोकाः' (बृ. ४–३–११; ४–४–८) इत्यादयः। सूत्राणि वस्तुसङ्ग्रहवाक्यानि वेदे यथा 'आत्मेत्येवोपासीत' (बृ. १–४–७) इत्यादीनि। अनुव्याख्यानानि मन्त्रविवरणानि। व्याख्यानान्यर्थवादाः। अथवा वस्तुसङ्ग्रहवाक्यविवरणान्यनुव्याख्यानानि।...मन्त्रविवरणानि व्याख्यानानि। एवमष्टविधं ब्राह्मणम्॥"

विद्वत्परिषत्सु यज्ञतत्त्वमधिकृत्य सञ्जाताः सवादविवादा ब्राह्मणाना कर्मकाण्डे सङ्ग्रथिताः, येभ्यः पूर्वमीमांसाशास्त्र परिवृद्धिं गतम्। तथा च परब्रह्मतत्त्वं पुरस्कृत्य परिषत्सु सम्भूताः सवादविवादा ब्राह्मणानामुपनिषत्संज्ञिते ब्रह्मकाण्डे (ज्ञानकाण्डे) सङ्कलिताः, यतश्चोत्तरमीमांसाशास्त्र सुविस्तृतिमापन्नम्। उभयत्रापि पुराणेतिहासाद्यर्थवादरूपेण परिचितवस्तूदाहरणरूपेण चोपमानप्रमाण प्राचुर्येणोपयुज्य, प्रत्यक्षप्रयोगावलम्बेन वस्तु प्रदर्श्य च गभीरविषयविवरणमुत्थाप्याकाङ्क्षापूर्वकं गुरुभिः प्रश्नप्रतिवचनभङ्ग्या विहित संलक्ष्यते। उत्थिताकाङ्क्षापुरस्सर प्रौढशिष्यैः पृष्टाना परिप्रश्नाना प्रतिवचनानि गुरुभिरुचितसमय एव व्याख्यानानुव्याख्यानतः प्रदेयानीत्यासीत्तदानीं मौखिकाध्यापनरीतिः। अत्रैव समुद्भूता प्रश्नोत्तरपद्धतिः संवादपद्धतिर्वा तदुत्तरभाविषु ग्रन्थेषु प्राधान्येन खण्डान्वयमुखेना समाश्रित दृश्यते। अतो या निर्वचनव्याख्यानपद्धतिः पूर्वं मुखत एव गुरुशिष्य-

परम्परया प्रचलिता, विद्वत्परिपत्रिर्णयैश्च ध्रुवत्य प्राप्ता सैव वेदोत्तरमाविपु ब्राह्मणग्रन्थेपु लेखनसनिविष्टाऽभवदित्यवधारयितु पार्यते।

यद्तत्त्व मूर्धन्यीकृत्य वेदाङ्गपट्कस्येषन्निर्देशो ब्राह्मणाना कर्मकाण्डे कृतो विद्यते। सामवेदान्तर्गतब्राह्मणेपु प्राधान्येन पद लेभिरे षडङ्गानि, यान्युत्तरवर्तिनि काले विविक्तवेन परिवृद्धिं जग्मुः। यथा मुण्डकोपनिषदि (१।१।५) तथा छान्दोग्येऽपि (७।१।२) वेदाना वेदः (व्याकरणम्), देवविद्या (निरुक्तम्), ब्रह्मविद्या (शिक्षाकल्पच्छन्दांसि), नक्षत्रविद्या (ज्यौतिषम्) इति शब्दान्तरेण वेदाङ्गाना निर्देशाज्ज्ञायते यदुपनिषत्काले सान्यपरिणतरूपेण *मौखिकपरम्परया वाऽविद्यन्त एव। अन्यथा शिक्षा-निरुक्तव्याकरणानामत्यन्ताभावे वेदाना स्वरस्थानप्रयत्नाद्यनपेत साधूच्चारणम्*, अर्थज्ञान, सहितायाः पदपाठे पदपाठस्य सहितायां वा विपरिणमन मित्यादीनामसम्भवाद् वेदरक्षामार्गे महानेव व्याघातः समुदपत्स्यत।

ब्राह्मणान्युपनिषदश्चेत्युभयोरन्तरवर्तिनि काले शाकल्येन सहितायाः पदपाठः प्रतिष्ठापित इत्यनुमीयते। 'पदप्रकृतिः सहिता' (ऋक्प्रातिशाख्यम्, २।१) 'परः सन्निकर्षः सहिता' (पा. १।४।१०९) इति सूत्रानुसारेण सहितापाठे यथास्थितानामेव पदाना सन्धियुक्तमुच्चारण, छन्दोनियमानन-तिक्रम्य विशिष्टस्वरवर्णोच्चारण चानिवार्ये स्त.। पदपाठे तु मन्त्रपदानि विच्छेदनपुरस्सर नियमैरेवोच्चार्यन्ते। अथ पदपाठः सन्धिसमासादिविग्रहपरो लौकिकसस्कृतस्य पदच्छेदरीतेः पूर्वतन स्वरूपम्। एतदर्थं नामाख्यातो-पसर्गनिपाताना चतुर्णां पदजाताना, सन्धिसमासाना च यज्ज्ञानमपेक्षित-*मासीत्तस्य गुरुमुखपरम्परयैव विद्यमानत्वात्पदपाठनिर्माणं सुशकमभवत्।* एतदेव व्याकरणसनाथ साधून्चारणशास्त्र केनचित्कालेन शिक्षाग्रन्थेपु प्रातिशाख्येपु च सनिविष्टमभवत्। 'पदप्रकृतीनि सर्वचरणाना (शाखान्तराणा) पार्षदानि (प्रातिशाख्यानि)' इति महर्षियास्केन प्रातिशाख्याना (वेदव्याकरणाना) स्वस्मात्पूर्वभावो निर्दिष्टः। तदानीं वेदवाङ्मय वृक्षस्य प्रभिन्नशाखाना विपुलविस्तारात्प्रतिवेदशाख वैदिकव्याकरणरूपाणि प्रातिशाख्यानि प्रभिन्नानि जातानि। पदपाठविरचने वेदाना सम्यगर्थ-निर्धारणमेव प्रयोजनम्। तदर्थं च समुत्पन्नानि शिक्षाव्याकरणनिरुक्तादी-

न्यर्थनिर्धारणसाधनानि वेदाङ्गत्वेन वेदव्याख्यानपराण्येवेत्यवगन्तव्यम्। वेदाङ्गानामुत्पत्तिविषये महर्षियास्को ब्रूते यत्– "साक्षात्कृतधर्माण ऋषयो बभूवुः। तेऽवरेभ्योऽसाक्षात्कृतधर्मभ्य उपदेशेन मन्त्रान् सम्प्रादुः। उपदेशाय ग्लायन्तो (खिद्यमानाः) अवरे बिल्मग्रहणाय (सुखग्रहणाय विस्तरण) इमं ग्रन्थ (निघण्टु) समाम्नासिषुर्वेद (वेदशाखाभेदान्) च वेदाङ्गानि च" (निरुक्तम् १।२०।२)। एव शिक्षाव्याकरणादिवेदाङ्गाना सद्भावाद्गीर्वाणवाण्याः साधूच्चारणविषये दत्तसूक्ष्मावधानैः पूर्वतनाध्यापकैर्यथा तस्याः पावित्र्यमद्य यावत्परिपालित, तथेदानीन्तनाध्यापकैरपि तत्परिपालनीय साधूच्चारणाभ्यासेनेति संस्मरणीयः सिद्धान्तोऽत्र समुदेति।

प्रातिशाख्येषु प्रायः स्थानप्रयत्नविवेकः, सज्ञा०, सन्धयः, क्वचित्पदनिर्वचन चेति विषया वेदभाषामधिकृत्य निरूपिताः, न तु कारकसमासतद्धितादिविषयाः, येऽविकलतया *पाणिनीयसूत्रेषु स्थानमलभन्त। शब्दनिर्वचन* ब्राह्मणेषु प्रातिशाख्येषु च विरलत्वेनोपलभ्यते तस्य प्रपञ्चो यास्काचार्येण निघण्टुव्याख्यानपरे स्वीयनिरुक्तग्रन्थे कृतः। तेन 'आख्यातजानि नामानि' इति शाकटायनसिद्धान्तमुररीकृत्य 'तदिद विद्यास्थान (निरुक्त) व्याकरणस्य कार्त्स्न्यं स्वार्थसाधक च'' (नि. १।१५।१) निर्मितम्। निर्वचनविषये शब्दचतुष्टय स्वीकृत्य यास्कमहर्षिणा गुर्वर्थाः सिद्धान्ताः समुद्भाविताः। ते यथा—

"तद्येषु पदेषु स्वरसस्कारौ समर्थौ प्रादेशिकेन गुणेन (धातुरूपेण) अन्वितौ स्याता तथा तानि निर्ब्रूयात्। अथानन्वितेऽर्थेऽप्रादेशिके विकारेऽर्थनित्यः (अर्थप्रधानः) परीक्षेत केनचिद् वृत्तिसामान्येन (क्रियागुणसामान्येन)......नैकपदानि (प्रकरणोत्पदरहितानि) निर्ब्रूयात् (निरु. अ. २, ख. १–३) इति।

अयं सिद्धान्तनिचयस्तदनन्तरभाविनः पाणिनेर्व्याकरणस्य प्रतिष्ठा, प्राचीनतमे काले समुद्भावितोऽप्याधुनिकभाषाशास्त्रविदा प्रमाणम्। आत्मनः पूर्ववर्तिना नैरुक्तवैयाकरणयाज्ञिकैतिहासिकनैदानादीना निर्देशो यास्काचार्येण निरुक्ते कृतः। तस्माद्वेदार्थविस्मरणेन ग्रन्थवैरल्येन च कृशीभूतोऽप्यय वेदनिरुक्तिप्रवाहो गुरुमुखपरम्परयैव यास्कं यावदागत इति प्रतीयते।

अयमेव प्रवाहो यास्काचार्येण स्थिरीकृतो निरुक्ते प्रश्नप्रतिवचनरूपेणैव व्याख्यानेनेति सन्द्रष्टव्यम्। इयं प्रश्नप्रतिवचनरूपा व्याख्यानपद्धतिर्निरुक्त-व्याख्यातारं दुर्गाचार्यं यावदविरतं सम्प्रातेत्यपि तद्व्याख्यातः प्रतीयते। वेदार्थ-निर्णायकोऽयं निघण्टुनिरुक्तपन्था अमरादिकोशैरुत्तरवर्तिनि काले किञ्चित्परि-वर्तनपुरस्सरं विशिष्टपदसहत्या क्षुण्णत्वं प्रापितः। प्रारम्भिकाध्यापनेऽनुपयुक्तेऽप्यस्मिन्निरुक्तिमार्गे, यास्कदुर्गादिभिरनुसृता प्रश्नप्रतिवचनरूपा व्याख्यानप-द्धतिर्वाङ्मयाध्यापने सुरुचिरेत्यत्र विज्ञातव्यम्। अपि च यास्काचार्यस्य बह्वर्थगम्भीरा सूत्रमयी भाषाऽनन्तरभाविनः सूत्रवाङ्मयस्य पूर्वरूपं व्यञ्जयति।

एतदनन्तरम्—

सरितामिव प्रवाहास्तुच्छाः प्रथमं यथोत्तरं विपुलाः।
ये शास्त्रसमारम्भा भवन्ति लोकस्य ते वन्द्याः॥ (काव्यमीमांसा)

इति न्यायेन वेदवाङ्मयस्य विभिन्नशाखाभिरपरिमेयव्यासः, वेदाङ्गज्ञानस्य मुखपरम्परया ग्रन्थपरम्परया चोपचयः, ग्रन्थप्रतिलिपीनां वैरल्यान्मौखिका-ध्ययने स्मृतिशक्तौ च महान् भार इत्येतेन कारणकदम्बकेन समासवचनरूपाः सूत्रग्रन्थाः समुद्भूता ज्ञानसन्ततये स्मृतिस्थापनसौकर्याय च। ज्ञानव्यवस्थितेः (शास्त्रदृष्टेः) ज्ञानसङ्क्रान्तिरीतेः (मौखिकाध्यापनपरिपाट्याः) च विशिष्ट प्राग्भावं विना, तत्तद्विषयपारदर्शित्वं विनाथ व्याससमासयोः प्रथमोत्क्रमोऽसुकर एवाभविष्यत्। उक्तं च राजशेखरेण यथा—'समासव्यासविन्यासः सैष शिष्यहिताय नः' इति।

सूत्रग्रन्थानां शैली लघुविविक्तवाक्यभूयिष्ठानां ब्राह्मणनिरुक्तादि-ग्रन्थानां समुत्कृष्टस्वरूपमेव व्यञ्जयति। अक्षरलाघवार्थं गम्भीराभिप्रायस्य समासतो वचनेनैव सूत्रग्रन्थेषु प्रथमतः समासभूयस्त्वमुपलभ्यते, यदुत्तर-कालीने लौकिकसंस्कृतवाङ्मये ओजोगुणविशिष्टाया गौडीरीतेः प्राधान्येन व्यपदेशकरं सञ्जातम्। समासभूयस्त्वेन सममाख्यातलोपः सुबन्तप्राधान्यं चेत्यपि सूत्रग्रन्थशैल्या वैशिष्ट्यं, यदप्यनन्तरभाविनि संस्कृतवाङ्मये परां कोटिं गतम्। यस्तन्तुसूत्रमिव सूत्रयति बध्नाति वाऽल्पाक्षरैः पदैरर्थं तदेव सूत्रम्। अक्षरलाघवे समासवचने चाप्यर्थगाम्भीर्यमर्थप्रतीतिराहित्यमित्या-दयो गुणाः सूत्रेऽपेक्ष्यन्त एव। अतः सूत्रलक्षणमभियुक्तैरुक्तं यथा—

अल्पाक्षरमसन्दिग्ध सारवद्विश्वतोमुखम्।
अस्तोभमनवद्यं च सूत्रं सूत्रकृतो विदु.॥

स्मृतिसौलभ्यसम्पादनद्वारा विषयतात्पर्यसुग्रह एव सूत्रग्रन्थाना प्रयोजनम्। अत एव सूत्रशैली न केवल वेदाङ्गेषु, यथोत्तर वैदिकदर्शनेषु च, किन्त्ववैदिकदर्शनेष्वपि सामान्यत्वेन पदमधिगतवतीत्युपलभ्यमानैस्तत्तद्ग्रन्थैरेव निश्चीयते। प्रतिवेदशाख प्रतिवेदाङ्ग प्रतिदर्शन वा ये सूत्रग्रन्था इदानीमुपलभ्यन्ते, तेभ्योऽपि समधिकाः पूर्वं प्रणीता आसन्निति प्रतीयते, यतोऽनुपलब्धाना सूत्रग्रन्थाना प्रणेतारस्तत्त-मतोपन्यासपूर्वकमुपलब्धसूत्रग्रन्थेषु नामतो निर्दिष्टाः सन्ति। समानविषय पुरस्कृत्यापि बहव सूत्रग्रन्था. पूर्वतनैर्विद्वद्भिर्विरचिता भवेयुर्येषा समत विमत च समालोच्य तदुत्तरतनैर्दोषवर्जमन्ये व्यापकसूत्रग्रन्था॰ प्रणीताः, येन पूर्वतनसूत्रग्रन्था निष्प्रयोजनत्वा द्विस्मृतिपथ प्रयाता इति पाणिनिजैमिनिव्यासादिकृतसूत्रेभ्योऽनुमीयते। असमाने सत्यपि विषये दर्शने वा, प्रतिपक्षभूतदार्शनिक-विमतोपन्यासपूर्वक-स्वीयसिद्धान्तास्तत्तद्दार्शनिकैर्निजसूत्रेषूपस्थापिता इति समालोक्यते। एतेषु सिद्धान्तेषु केचिद्विद्वत्परिषत्सु प्रत्यक्ष सञ्जाताना सवादविवादाना मौखिक निर्णया एव सूत्ररूपेण सङ्कलिता इत्युक्तिः प्रायो निर्बाधा स्यात्।

प्रतिशास्त्र सूत्राणि यथाकाल यथावश्य च समुद्भूतानि, किन्तु समुत्पद्यमानाना तेषा य॰ क्रम. पूर्वमासीत्स एवाद्य यावदचलरूपेणायात इति नैव कल्पयितु पार्यते। सर्वेषा सूत्राणा प्रतिशास्त्र सञ्जातेऽन्तिमे सङ्कलने विषयस्य तात्पर्यानुरोधेनाभिमतपूर्वोत्तरभावानुसारेण च स आदिमोऽनुक्रम॰ परिवर्तन प्राप्य स्थिरीभूत इति प्रतीयते। यथाऽधुनातनलेखकस्य विमर्शविषयीभूत. कश्चित्प्रबन्ध आदौ विशिष्टक्रमेण प्रस्फुरन्नन्तर चाभिमत-स्वरूपेण भिन्नक्रममधिगत्यान्तिम ध्वाकार प्राप्नोति तथैवेय स्थितिः स्यात्। कालानुक्रमेण प्रतिशास्त्र सूत्रसमुच्चयाना ज्ञेयविषयसङ्गत्यनुरोधनाऽ[१]ध्यायपादा

---

१ शास्त्रेऽध्याये तथा पादे न्यायसङ्गतयस्त्रिधा।
शास्त्रादिविषये ज्ञाते तत्तत्सङ्गतिरूह्यताम्॥

धिकरणादीन् विभागान् प्रकल्प्य पुनश्च प्रत्यधिकरणं[1] विषयसंशयपूर्वपक्ष-
सिद्धान्तसङ्गतिरूपाणि पञ्चाङ्गानि सविभक्तानि तत्तच्छास्त्रविद्भिः, येन तत्त-
च्छास्त्रसमाविष्टं ज्ञानं तत्तद्विशिष्टपद्धतिसनाथं व्यवस्थितिं प्राप्तम्। मीमांसा-
वेदान्तशास्त्रयोरेतज्ज्ञानव्यवस्थितिप्रधानं पद्धतिशास्त्रं परमां वृद्धिं लेभे।
व्याकरणसूत्रव्यवस्थितिः प्रायोऽध्यायपादादिक्रमेणैव सञ्जाता, किन्तु तत्सूत्र-
सङ्गतौ यद्वैशिष्ट्यमधिकरणस्थलेऽधिकारसूत्राणि विरच्य श्रीपाणिनिना
प्रकल्पितं, तत्पृथक्तया विवेचनार्हं भवति।

यद्यपि सूत्रेषु तात्पर्यसुग्रहत्वं विद्यते, तथापि साङ्गोपाङ्गविवरण-
द्वारा सम्यग्विषयावगमसमनन्तरमेव तात्पर्यावधारणं सुकरं, न तु सूत्र-
पठनमात्रेण। तस्माद्गुरुकालं यावत् तत्तद्विषयाध्यापकैर्मुखत एव सविस्तरं
विषयव्याख्यानं कार्यं, शिष्यैश्च तदविकलतयाऽऽकलय्य सूत्राणि कण्ठस्थी-
कार्याणि, पुनश्च तैः शिष्यैः स्वशिष्या यथापूर्वमेव मौखिकव्याख्यानेना-
ध्यापनीया इतीयं परम्पराऽविच्छेदेन चिरकालं प्रस्तुता स्यात्। यद्यप्यसन्दि-
ग्धत्वमेव सूत्रस्य विशिष्टलक्षणं, तथाप्यल्पाक्षरत्वेनैव तत्प्रायः सन्दिग्धत्वं
भजत इति सार्वजनीनोऽनुभवः। मुखतः सूत्रव्याख्यानेऽनुक्तानां पदानाम-
ध्याहारः, उक्तपदानां च विग्रहयोजनापूर्वकं सकलसारभूतं सरलसुबोधं
विवेचनमिति स्यात्पूर्वं मौखिकाध्यापनरीतिर्या केनचित्कालेन वृत्तिनामके
टीकाप्रभेदेऽक्षरसन्निवेशं लेभे। अनुक्तपदप्रपूरणेन सूत्रार्थस्य छन्दोबद्धायां
कारिकायां ग्रथनं स्मृतिसौकर्यार्थमेव सञ्जज्ञे। सूत्रमपि कृत्स्नोक्तानुक्तदुरुक्त-
चिन्तापरा गद्यरूपवृत्तेर्भिन्ना गद्यनिबद्धाश्छन्दोनिबद्धा वा वार्तिकग्रन्था-
प्राय आदित एव ग्रन्थरूपेणावतीर्णाः स्युः, यतः सूत्रपाठे ग्रन्थरूपेण स्थिरी-
भूत एव वार्तिकानामुत्पत्तिः सुघटेति भाति पाणिनीयसूत्राण्युद्दिश्य विर-
चितेभ्यः कात्यायनवार्तिकेभ्यः। वृत्तिवार्तिकयोः सम्भवो भाष्यग्रन्थेभ्यः पूर्व-
ज्ञात इति पातञ्जलमहाभाष्यनिर्दिष्टवार्तिकेभ्यः शाबरशाङ्करभाष्योल्लिखित-
वृत्तिग्रन्थेभ्यश्च सम्भाव्यते। अपि च सूत्राणां सरलसुबोधव्याख्यानरूपाया
मूलार्थप्रकाशिकाया गद्यवृत्तेरनन्तरं तेषामुक्तानुक्तदुरुक्तचिन्तापराणां वार्ति-
कानां प्रवृत्तिस्तदुत्तरमेव पराक्षेपनिरासपुरःसरं भाष्यरूपेण मुखतो लेखतो वा

---

[1] विषयो विशयश्चैव पूर्वपक्षस्तथोत्तरम्।
सङ्गतिश्चेति पञ्चाङ्गं शास्त्रेऽधिकरणं विदुः॥

व्याख्यानमित्यनेन नैसर्गिकक्रमेणैव व्याख्यानपद्धतिः परमां विस्तृतिं प्राप्ता। टीकाप्रभेदानामेतत्पौर्वापर्यं तु नियतमेवेति न मन्तव्यं, यतोऽनुकरणमात्रबुद्ध्याऽर्वाक्तनेऽपि काले सूत्रादिनिर्माणं नासम्भवम्। विशेषतोऽत्र समवधेयं यदुपनिषन्निरुक्तादिषु या प्रश्नप्रतिवचनपद्धतिः पूर्वमध्यापने समाश्रिताऽऽसीत्सैव सविशेषं पातञ्जलमहाभाष्ये शाबरभाष्ये चानुसृता दृश्यते। प्रत्यक्षतः पृष्टाः कल्पिता वा शिष्याणां सन्देहाः, प्रतिपक्षिणां पूर्वपक्षभूताः पुरत उपस्थापिताः सम्भाव्या वाऽऽक्षेपाश्च प्रश्नप्रणाल्या प्रागुक्तभाष्यद्वये सङ्ग्रथितास्तेषां प्रतिवचनानि च स्वसिद्धान्तरूपेण। या सूत्रव्याख्यानरीतिर्मौखिकाध्यापने गुरुभिः पूर्वं समाश्रिता तस्या एव लिखितरूपं निदर्शनमुत्तरभाविषु वृहदाकारेषु भाष्यमन्येषु लभ्यते। एवं पाणिनिपतञ्जलिप्रभृतिभिर्वैयाकरणैः प्रदर्शिता पदव्याख्यानरीतिः, जैमिनिशबरस्वामिप्रभृतिभिर्मीमांसकैराविष्कृता वाक्यार्थनिर्णयरीतिः, गौतमादिनैयायिकैः प्रकटीकृता प्रमाणपरीक्षारीतिश्चेतीयं व्याख्यात्रिपथगा सुविमर्शजलसमृध्दया ज्ञानक्षेत्रं सस्यफलसम्पन्नमातन्वाना वैदिकावैदिकसकलदार्शनिकमान्या शिष्यजनोपकर्त्री च सञ्जज्ञे।

सूत्रनिर्माणकालात्पूर्वं यथा वेदार्थसाधनभूतानां षडङ्गानां तथा षड्दर्शनानामपि मौखिकी परम्पराऽविच्छिन्नाऽऽसीत्। अन्यथा षड्दर्शनसूत्राणां विरचनमसम्भवमभविष्यत्। यज्ञतत्त्वपुरस्कारेण ब्राह्मणादिग्रन्थैरुपबृंहितं धर्मशास्त्रोपकारि च यन्मीमांसाशास्त्रं तत्सूत्रकाले जैमिनिकृतन्यायसाहस्त्या वेदार्थनिर्णयविषये सम्पूर्णतां परमं प्रामाण्यं चोपजगाम। 'न्याय'-शब्दोऽत्र न केवलं गौतमीयन्यायशास्त्रवाची, किन्तु लोकव्यवहारागमयुक्तिसिद्धन्यायवाच्यपि। एते जैमिनिसूत्रस्थिता मीमांसान्यायाः शब्दतत्त्वमप्रतो निधायार्थनिर्धारणे साधनभूताः सन्तो यथा धर्मशास्त्रनिर्णये तथा व्याकरणसूत्रनियोजनरीतौ परिभाषारूपेणापि परमोपकारकाः सञ्जज्ञिरे। एवं मीमांसाशास्त्रं न केवलं धर्मशास्त्रस्य, अपि तु व्याकरणाद्यन्यशास्त्राणामप्युपकारकं सम्भूतमित्यनुमीयते। गौतमकृतन्यायसूत्रात्पूर्वं तर्कशास्त्रम् 'आन्वीक्षिकी' इत्यभिधानेन लोकेषु मुखपरम्परया सुप्रचारं, चरकसंहितायां चाक्षरसन्निविष्टं जातम्। न्यायशास्त्रपरपर्यायैषाऽऽन्वीक्षिकी विद्या कौटिलीयार्थशास्त्रे–"हेतुभिरन्वीक्षमाणाऽऽन्वीक्षिकी लोकस्योपकरोति, व्यसनेऽभ्युदये च बुद्धिमवस्थापयति, प्रज्ञावाक्यक्रियावैशारद्यं च करोति–

प्रदीपः सर्वविद्यानामुपायः सर्वकर्मणाम्।
आश्रयः सर्वधर्माणां शश्वदान्वीक्षिकी मता॥"

इति यथार्थस्तुतिवाक्यैः समुत्कृष्टां ख्यातिं प्राप। एवं सूत्रनिर्माणकालात्पूर्वं तदनन्तरमपि षडङ्गेषु 'मुखं व्याकरणं स्मृतम्' इति शिक्षावचनानुसारेण व्याकरणं, षड्दर्शनेषु धर्मशास्त्रोपकारि पूर्वमीमांसाशास्त्रमुत्तरमीमांसाशास्त्रं च, तथा प्रमाणोपबृंहितं सर्वशास्त्रोपकारकं न्यायशास्त्रं चेति शास्त्रचतुष्टयं सविशेषं पाठ्यक्रमसमाविष्टं बभूव। परस्परोपकारित्वात्तानि सर्वाण्यपि शास्त्राणि कस्यचिदपि जनस्याध्ययने समकक्षत्वं समसविभागं च भेजिरे। किन्त्वध्ययनानुक्रमे व्याकरणमेव मुखत्वेनादौ समानं लेभे। यतः "प्रधानं च षट्स्वङ्गेषु व्याकरणम्। प्रधाने च कृतो यत्नः फलवान् भवति" (पात. म. भा. १।१)। तथा च 'काणादं पाणिनीयं च सर्वशास्त्रोपकारकम्' इत्युक्तिः काणादोपलक्षितन्यायशास्त्रसिद्धान्तानां पाणिनीयव्याकरणसिद्धान्तानां न केवलं व्यापकत्वं प्रकटयन्ति, किन्तु प्रायो निखिलवैदिकावैदिकदार्शनिकमान्यत्वमपि। यतः सत्स्वपि विभिन्नसम्प्रदायेषु व्याकरणेषु, वेदाङ्गत्वेन शिरोधार्यतां गतं पाणिनीयव्याकरणं बौद्धाद्यवैदिकदार्शनिकेष्वपि पाठ्यत्वेन प्रभूतादरभाजनमभवदिति 'इत्सिङ्ग–ह्युएन्त्सङ्ग'–प्रभृतिचीनयात्रिकाणां वृत्तान्तेभ्योऽवगम्यते। एवं तदानीं सत्यामपि तौलनिकज्ञानाधिगमप्रवृत्तौ, अनन्तरवर्तिनि काले 'द्वादशवर्षैर्व्याकरणं श्रूयते' (पञ्चतन्त्रम्) इत्यादीनि वचनानि परिवृत्तिं गतामध्ययनाध्यापनरीतिं ख्यापयन्ति। अतो नैतच्चित्रं यद्वेदाध्ययनापेक्षया वेदाङ्गैकाध्ययन एव प्रदीर्घं कालं यापयतां शिष्याणां मतिस्तौलनिकज्ञानापेक्षया शास्त्रैकदेशनैपुण्ये दर्शनैकदेशवैदग्ध्यसम्पादने वाऽधिकतरं व्यासक्तेति। तथापि पदवाक्यप्रमाणपराणां यथोत्तरं व्याकरणमीमांसान्यायशास्त्राणामन्योन्यपूरकत्वसिद्धये, शास्त्रदृष्टेः पूर्णत्वापादनाय च, अधिगतेऽपि व्याकरणादिविशिष्टशास्त्रस्य साङ्गोपाङ्गे ज्ञाने, मीमांसान्यायाद्यन्यशास्त्राणां स्थूलं ज्ञानं प्रत्येकं पण्डितेनाधिगन्तव्यमिति प्रणाल्यद्य यावद्भारते प्रचलिता दरीदृश्यते। यथा–शताब्देऽपि महाभाष्यान्तव्याकरणप्रावीण्ये,प्रत्येकं शास्त्रिप्रवरेण 'सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि' यावन्न्यायशास्त्रस्य, 'मीमांसान्यायप्रकाश' यावत्पूर्वमीमांसाया', 'वेदान्तपरिभाषा' यावदुत्तरमीमांसायाश्च तौलनिक-

शास्त्रदृष्टिसम्पादकमध्ययनमवश्यं विधेयमिति विद्यते सम्प्रदायोऽद्यापि प्राचीनानां संस्कृताध्ययनाध्यापनपरिपाट्याम्। सत्यवकाश एतदधिकशास्त्राणामप्यध्ययनं विधीयेत केनापि कुशाग्रमतिमता, किन्तु नायं सार्वत्रिको नियमः। उक्तमत्र विषये सुश्रुते यथा—

> एकं शास्त्रमधीयानो न विद्याच्छास्त्रनिश्चयम्।
> तस्माद्बहुश्रुतः शास्त्रं विजानीयाच्चिकित्सकः॥

एतैः पदवाक्यप्रमाणपरैः शास्त्रैः शब्दतत्त्वमधिकृत्याऽऽविष्कृतेष्वभिप्रायेषु यथा वैमत्यं तथा समन्वयोऽपि परिलक्ष्यते। तत्समन्वयाधारेणाऽऽलङ्कारिकैः शब्दतत्त्वसङ्कलनं साहित्यशास्त्रे कृत्वोत्तरतनगुरुशिष्याणां कृते काव्यपठनपाठनयोर्महती पदवी निर्मिता। एतेषां व्याकरणमीमांसान्यायादीनां प्रतिशास्त्रं शब्दतत्त्वानि, तेषां तत्त्वानां पूर्वोत्तरभावं गौणप्रधानभावं चाधिकृत्य तत्र तत्रोपलभ्यमानं ज्ञानव्यवस्थितिपदवाच्यं प्रयोगप्रमुखं पद्धतिविज्ञानं, तेषां सकलानामपि समन्वयसाधनानीत्यादयो विषया अत्र परिगणनार्हाः, तेषां तत्त्वानामालङ्कारिकैर्विहितः समन्वयोऽप्यत्र संलक्ष्यः। किन्तु प्रकृतप्रबन्धभूरिविस्तरभिया तत्कर्मणोऽत्र विरम्यते। अपि च तेषां तत्त्वानां पठनपाठनोपयुक्ताः केचिदंशाः "Oriental Methodology of Education" इत्यस्मदीयाऽऽङ्ग्लभाषागतप्रबन्धे समुपन्यस्ता इत्यतः पुनरुक्तिदोषोऽप्यत्र परिवर्ज्यते। आङ्ग्लभाषाभिज्ञैरुपर्युल्लिखितशब्दतत्त्वानि तस्मिन्नाङ्ग्लभाषागतप्रबन्ध एव नयनविषयीकर्तव्यानि। अत्र तु सङ्क्षेपार्थं समुपन्यस्यन्ते प्राचीने काले विद्वत्संसद्भिर्निर्णीताः, गुरुमुखपरम्परामार्गेणाऽऽयाताः, पदवाक्यप्रमाणपरा अत एव शब्दतत्त्वमवलम्बमानाः, शास्त्रव्यवस्थितिपदवाच्या अत एव तन्त्रयुक्त्यपराभिधानाः, गीर्वाणवाङ्मये लेखसन्निविष्टाः सर्वव्यापिन्योऽर्थनिर्धारणरीतयो, या न केवलमायुर्वेदार्थनिर्णयेऽर्थशास्त्रार्थनिश्चये, अपि तु सर्वशास्त्रार्थनियोजने सामान्यतः साधनभूताः सत्यः पौरस्त्यानां पद्धतिविज्ञानस्य पूर्वतनं स्वरूपं सुविशदं प्रदर्शयन्ति। परिकलनीयमत्र यद् व्याकरणमीमांसान्यायादिशास्त्राणां समुपन्यासोचिता भाषातत्त्वविषयिणः सिद्धान्ता एतास्वर्थनिर्धारणरीतिरूपासु तन्त्रयुक्तिषु गतार्था इति, यतः शब्दतत्त्वावलम्बिन्य शास्त्रत्रययुक्तय एवात्र समासेनोपनिबद्धाः सन्ति।

भाषातत्त्वस्वरूपं द्विविधम् । प्रथमं भाषायास्तत्त्वज्ञानं (Theory), द्वितीयं च तस्याः प्रयोगविज्ञानम् (Practice) । प्रयोगविज्ञानमेव पद्धतिशास्त्रस्वरूपेणावतीर्णं सद्भिज्ञजनानां क्रियाकौशलं विविधैः प्रकारैरभिव्यनक्ति । आदौ भाषायास्तत्त्वज्ञाने, भाषोत्पत्तेर्भाषाया बहिराविष्कृतेश्चाऽऽध्यात्मिकं व्यापारमनुसृत्य सूक्ष्माभितत्त्वानां उद्घाटनं समावेशमर्हति । अनन्तरं भाषायाः प्रयोगविज्ञाने भाषातत्त्वज्ञानं तयोरयोक्तव्यं, यथा भाषाध्ययनाध्यापनक्रमो बालानां बोधसौकर्याय रुच्यै च भवेत् । भाषायास्तत्त्वज्ञानं यथा पौरस्त्यानामाद्यग्रन्थेषु तदुत्तरकालीनेषु व्याकरण-मीमांसान्यायदर्शनेषु च, तथा भाषायाः प्रयोगविज्ञानमादौ मौलिकाध्यापने तदनु चार्थविवृतिपरेषु टीकाग्रन्थेषु, पदमलभत । टीकाग्रन्थेष्वपि कदाचिदुभयोर्भाषातत्त्वज्ञान–प्रयोगविज्ञानयोः, कदाचिच्च प्रयोगविज्ञानमात्रस्योपन्यासः क्रियते । अतः प्रयोगविज्ञानप्रधानं टीकावाङ्मयमेव पौरस्त्यानां पद्धतिशास्त्रस्याध्यापनपद्धतीनां च मूर्तिमन्निदर्शनमिति निर्देष्टुं शक्यम् । अतोऽस्माभिरप्यमानासु तन्त्रयुक्तिषु तु भाषायास्तत्त्वज्ञानं स्वयमन्तर्हितं भवत्प्रयोगविज्ञानमेव विस्पष्टमग्रतो निदधाति । एतास्तन्त्रयुक्तयष्टीकाग्रन्थेष्वर्थविवृत्यर्थं समाश्रिताः सन्ति । भाषायास्तत्त्वज्ञानस्य प्रयोगविज्ञानरूपेण विपरिणमनं, गवेषणापूर्वकं प्राचीनाध्यापनपद्धतेर्निवेदनं, तदुचितमार्गस्याधुनिकाध्यापने हितकारि नियोजनमित्येव विषयेऽस्मदीयं मुख्यं प्रयोजनम् । अतष्टीकाकृद्वचनेष्वाधेयास्तन्त्रयुक्तयो गुरुशिष्यजनोपकृतयेऽत्रोदाह्रियन्ते । तन्त्रं नाम शास्त्रं प्रयोगविधानं वा । तस्मिञ्शास्त्रे प्रयोगविज्ञाने वा या अर्थसाधनरीतयो युज्यन्ते तास्तन्त्रयुक्तयः शास्त्रभूषणानि भवन्ति । उक्तमभियुक्तैस्तासां तन्त्रयुक्तीनां सर्वव्यापित्वं, यथा—

तन्त्रे समासव्यासोक्ता भवन्त्येता हि कृत्स्नशः ।
एकदेशेन दृष्टा तु समासाभिहितं यथा ॥
एकस्मिन्नपि यस्येह शास्त्रे लब्धा सदा मतिः ।
स शास्त्रमन्यदप्याशु युक्तिं ज्ञात्वा प्रबुध्यते ॥
अधीयानोऽपि शास्त्राणि तन्त्रयुक्त्यविचक्षणः ।
नाधिगच्छति शास्त्रार्थानर्थान् भाग्यक्षये यथा ॥

दुर्गृहीतं क्षिणोत्येव शास्त्रं शस्त्रमिवाबुधम्।
सुगृहीतं तदेव ज्ञं शास्त्रं शस्त्रं च रक्षति॥

द्विविधं प्रयोजनं तावत् तन्त्रयुक्तीनाम्। वाक्ययोजनमर्थयोजनं चेति। "वाक्यस्यासम्बद्धस्य योजनं सम्बन्धनं वाक्ययोजनम्"। "लीनस्यासङ्गतस्य चार्थस्य प्रकाशनं सङ्गतीकरणं चार्थयोजनम्"। एतदर्थाश्चात्र श्लोकाः सन्ति—

असद्वादिप्रयुक्तानां वाक्यानां प्रतिषेधनम्।
स्ववाक्यसिद्धिरपि च क्रियते तन्त्रयुक्तिभिः॥
व्यक्ता नोक्तास्तु ये ह्यर्था लीना ये चाप्यनिर्मलाः।
लेशोक्ता ये च केचित्स्युस्तेषां चापि प्रसाधनम्॥
यथाम्बुजवनस्यार्कः प्रदीपो वेश्मनो यथा।
प्रबोधस्य प्रकाशार्थं तथा तन्त्रस्य युक्तयः॥

एतास्तन्त्रयुक्तयः सुश्रुतसंहितायां कौटिलीयार्थशास्त्रे च द्वात्रिंशत्सङ्ख्याकाः, चरकसंहितायां षट्त्रिंशत्सङ्ख्याकाः, अन्यत्र च चत्वारिंशत्सङ्ख्याकाः परिगणिताः। चरकसंहितायां तासामुद्देशो यथा—

तत्राधिकरणं योगो हेत्वर्थोऽर्थः पदस्य च।
प्रदेशोद्देशनिर्देशवाक्यशेषाः प्रयोजनम्॥
उपदेशापदेशातिदेशार्थापत्तिनिर्णयाः।
प्रसङ्गैकान्तनैकान्ताः सापवर्गो विपर्ययः॥
पूर्वपक्षविधानानुमतव्याख्यानसंशयाः।
अतीतानागतावेक्षा–स्वसंज्ञोहसमुच्चयाः॥
निदर्शनं निर्वचनं सन्नियोगो विकल्पनम्।
प्रत्युत्सारस्तथोद्धारः सम्भवस्तन्त्रयुक्तयः॥

अत्र योगोद्देशनिर्देशादीनां वाक्ययोजनं प्रयोजनं, अधिकरणपदार्थोह्यादीनामर्थयोजनं च प्रयोजनम्। एतासां तन्त्रयुक्तीनां सोदाहरणानि लक्षणानि, यथा—

८ वाक्यशेष –येन पदेनानुक्तेन वाक्य परिसमाप्यते स वाक्यशेषः। यस्यार्थेन वाक्येषु यदगम्यमानतया पूर्तये पूरण स वाक्यशेषः। यथा–प्रवृत्तिर्हेतुभावानामित्यत्र 'अस्ति' इति पद पूर्यते। वाक्यवत् पदानि शेषाश्च क्रियन्ते येऽनिवेशिता अपि प्रतीयन्ते (चक्र)। येन वाक्य समाप्यते स वाक्यशेषः (कौ. अ.)।

* ९ प्रयोजनम् –यदर्थमारभ्यन्त आरम्भास्तत्प्रयोजनम् (ग.)। यदर्थं कामयमाना प्रवृत्तिस्तद् (चक्र.)।

१० उपदेश – इदमव (कुर्यात्) इद नैवमिति यदुच्यते।–तथा न जागृयाद्रात्रौ दिवा स्वप्न च वर्जयेत्। उपदेशो नामाप्तानुशासनम्। अत्र प्रायिक उपदेश। उपदेशो नियोगात् भिद्यते, यतो नियोगे व्यभिचारो नास्ति, अप्रायिकत्वादपरिहार्य च विद्यते। यथा–पथ्यमेव भोक्तव्यमिति। एव वर्तितव्यमित्युपदश. (कौ. अ)।

११ अपदेश.– अनेन कारणेनेदमिति (कार्यं प्रति हेतुकथनम्) अपदेश। अपदशो नाम यत् प्रतिज्ञातार्थसाधनाय हेतुवचनम्। तत्प्रतिज्ञातार्थस्य हेतुवचन दुष्परिहरत्वादिति (चक्र.)। एवमसावाहेत्यपदेशः (कौ. अ.)।

१२ अतिदेश– उक्तेन साधनमतिदेशः (कौ. अ.)। यत्प्रकृतस्यानागतेन (भविष्यता) साधन अतिदेशः (ग.)। अतिदेशो नाम यत्किञ्चित्प्रकाशयार्थमनुक्तार्थसाधनायैवमन्यदपि प्रत्येतव्यमिति परिभाष्यते। यथा–"यच्चान्यदपि किञ्चित्स्यादनुक्तमिह पूजितम्। पूर्णं तदपि चात्रेयः सदैवमनुमन्यते" (चक्र)।

१३ अर्थापत्ति.–यत्र केनचिदर्थेनोक्तेन परस्यार्थस्यानुक्तस्य सिद्धिः (ग)। अर्थापत्तिर्नाम यदकीर्तितम् (अप्रतिपादितम्) इति मत्वाऽर्थादापद्यते साऽर्थापत्ति। यथा–'ओदन भोक्ष्ये' इत्युक्तेऽर्थादापन्न भवति–नाय पिपासुर्यवागूमिति। (चक्र.)। यदनुक्तमर्थादापद्यते सार्थापत्तिः (कौ. अ.)।

१४ निर्णयः (उत्तरपक्षः)– यत्पूर्वपक्षस्योत्तरवचनं स निर्णयः (ग.)। निर्णयो नाम विचारितस्यार्थस्य व्यवस्थापनम्। (चक्र.)। तस्य (पूर्वपक्षस्य) निर्णयनवाक्यमुत्तरपक्षो वा (कौ. अ.)।

१५ प्रसङ्ग.– यत्प्रकरणान्तरेण समाप्यते स प्रसङ्गः, यद्वा प्रकरणान्तरितो योऽर्थोऽसकृदुक्त समाप्यते स प्रसङ्ग. (ग)। प्रसङ्गो नाम पूर्वाभिहितस्यार्थस्य प्रकरणागतत्वात्पुनरभिधानम्। (चक्र)। प्रकरणान्तरेण समानोऽर्थ प्रसङ्ग. (कौ. अ.)।

१६ एकान्त – सर्वत्र यदवधारणेन (अविकल्पेन, नियमेन) उच्यते स एकान्त। उदाहरणेऽवधारणवाचिन एवकारस्य निर्देशात्। अवधारण विधेयायोगव्यवच्छेद। तथा च पार्थ एव सर्वोत्कृष्टधनुर्धर इति पार्थे सर्वोत्कृष्टधनुर्धरत्वानायोगव्यवच्छेदेनैकान्त। सर्वत्रायत्तमेकान्त (कौ अ.)।

१७ नैकान्त (अनेकान्त)–क्वचित्तथा क्वचिदन्यथेति य सोऽनेकान्त। क्वचित्तथाऽऽर्थिरि तथा क्वचिदन्यथेति। यथा–सन्ति ह्येके प्रत्यक्ष-पराः परोक्षत्वात् पुनर्भवस्य नास्तिक्यमाश्रिता., सन्ति चापरे आगमप्रत्यया-देव पुनर्भवमिच्छन्तीति (ग.)। नैकान्त. पुनरलुप्तप्रबन्धात् सर्वगो न चेदित्यादिनान्यतरपक्षावधारणम् (चक्र.)।

१८ अपवर्ग –अभिप्लुतस्यापकर्षणमपवर्ग (कौ. अ.)। यद-भिव्याप्यापकर्षण सोऽपवर्ग (ग.)। साकल्येनोद्दिष्टस्यैकदेशापकर्षणम्। गुणक्रियादिभि सर्वतो वाऽभिव्याप्य कस्यचित्तदर्थस्य तेभ्यो गुणक्रियादिभ्य. पृथक्करणमपवर्ग। यथा–सर्वमम्ल पित्तकरमन्यत्र दाडिमामलकात्।

१९ विपर्यय –यदभिहित तस्य प्रातिलोम्य (विपरीत ग्रहणम्) विपर्यय। विपर्ययेण विपरीतमेव गम्यते, अर्थान्तराद्विपरीत एव अर्थः प्रतीयत इत्यनयोर्भेद। यथा–कृशाल्पप्राणभीरवो दुश्चिकित्स्या इत्युक्ते विपरीत दृढादय सुचिकित्स्या इति। प्रतिलोमेन साधन विपर्यय. (कौ. अ)।

२० पूर्वपक्ष –आक्षेपपूर्वक प्रश्न पूर्वपक्ष (ग.)। पूर्वपक्षो नाम प्रतिज्ञातार्थवाक्यार्थसन्देहक वाक्यम् (चक्र.)। प्रतिषेद्धव्य वाक्य पूर्वपक्ष. (कौ. अ)।

२१ विधानम्–प्रकरणानुपूर्व्याऽभिहित विधानम् (ग.)। केचित्तु प्रकरणानुपूर्व्याभिधान विधानमाहु (चक्र.)। प्रकरण प्रकरणानुपूर्व्या विधानम् (कौ अ)।

२२ अनुमतम्-यत्परमतमप्रतिषिध्योच्यते तदनुमतम्। यथा-तत्रातीन्द्रिय पुनर्मनः सत्त्वसंज्ञक चेत इत्याहुरेके (ग.)। अनुमतं नाम सह एकीयमतस्यानिवारणेनानुमननम् (चक्र.)। परवाक्यमप्रतिषिद्धमनुमतम्। (कौ. अ.)।

२३ व्याख्यानम्-अतिशयवर्णना व्याख्यानम् (कौ. अ.)। यदतिशयेन वर्णन (ख्यापन) तद् व्याख्यानम् (गं.)। व्याख्यान नाम यत्सर्वबुद्धिविषय व्याक्रियते, यथा-"प्रथमे मासि सम्मूर्छितः सर्वधातुकलुषीकृतः खेटभूतो भवत्यव्यक्तविग्रहः" इत्यादिना वाक्यस्य विदितार्थस्य व्याकरणम्।

२४ संशयः-उभयतो हेतुमानर्थः संशयः (कौ. अ.)। उभयहेतुदर्शनं संशयः। उभयोर्विसदृशयोरर्थयोर्हेतुस्तस्य दर्शनम्। यथा-इतश्च्युताः पुनर्भविष्यामो न वेति संशयः, कस्मात्? सन्ति ह्येके प्रत्यक्षपराः परोक्षत्वात् पुनर्भवस्य नास्तिक्यमाश्रिताः, सन्ति चापरे आगमप्रत्ययादेव पुनर्भव मिच्छन्तीति (ग.)। विशेषाकाङ्क्षावारितोभयविषयज्ञान वा संशयः (चक्र.)। संशयो नाम सन्दिग्धेष्वर्थेष्वनिश्चय. (ग.)।

२५ अतीतावेक्षा (अतिक्रान्तावेक्षणम्)-यत्पूर्वमुक्त तदतिक्रान्तस्यातीतस्य पुनरवेक्षणम्। पुरस्तादेव विहितमित्यतिक्रान्तावेक्षणम् (कौ. अ.)।

२६ अनागतावेक्षा (अनागतावेक्षणम्)-यदेव वक्ष्यतीत्यवेक्ष्यते तदनागतावेक्षणम् (ग.)। यदनागत (भविष्यन्त) विधिं प्रमाणीकृत्यार्थसाधनम् (कार्यार्थमवलोकनम्) (चक्र)। पश्चादेव विहितमित्यनागतावेक्षणम् (कौ. अ.)।

२७ स्वसंज्ञा-या न शास्त्रान्तरसामान्या सा स्वसंज्ञा (ग.)। सुश्रुते च -अन्यशास्त्रासामान्या स्वसंज्ञा। अन्यानि शास्त्राणि व्याकरणादीनि, तेषु असामान्या-असाधारणा, तत्राननुगता स्वशास्त्रेष्वेव प्रयोजनवतीत्यर्थः (डल्हणः-ड.)। या तन्त्रकारैर्व्यवहारार्थे संज्ञा क्रियते सा (चक्र.)। परैरसमित. शब्द, स्वसंज्ञा (कौ. अ.)।

२८ ऊह्यम्—यदनिर्दिष्टं बुद्धिमता बुद्ध्याऽवगम्यते तदूह्यम् (सुश्रुतम्—सु)। ऊहो नाम पदनिबन्धमन्ये प्रज्ञया तर्कयित्वेनोपदेश्यते, यथा—'यदुक्तमप्यनुक्तं सत् तदेत्यत्रापकर्षयेत्' इत्यादि (चक्र.)। बुद्धिगम्यमूह्यम् (ड.)। अनुक्तकरमूह्यम् (को. अ.)।

२९ समुच्चय—यदिद चेद चेत्युच्यते स समुच्चयः (ग.)। यदा-दितदन्ते 'च' कृत्वा विधीयते, यथा—वर्णश्च स्वरश्चेत्यादि (चक्र.)। अनेन चानेन चेति समुच्चयः (को. अ.)।

३० निदर्शनम्—यत्र दृष्टान्तेनार्थप्रसाधनं तन्निदर्शनम्। सुश्रुते च-दृष्टान्तेनार्थः प्रसाध्यते यत्र तन्निदर्शनम्। अत एव च निदर्शनात् हेत्वर्थो भिद्यते, हेत्वर्थस्य दृष्टान्तमात्रत्वात् (ग.)। निदर्शनं नाम मूर्खविदुषां बुद्धिसाम्यविषयो दृष्टान्तः (चक्र.)। दृष्टान्तो दृष्टान्तयुक्तो निदर्शनम् (को. अ.)।

३१ निर्वचनम्—यन्निश्चितमुच्यते तन्निर्वचनम्। यथा—आयु-र्वेदयतीति, आयुर्विद्यतेऽस्मिन्ननेन वा, आयुर्विन्दतीत्यायुर्वेद इति (ग.)। निर्वचनं नाम पण्डितबुद्धिगम्यो दृष्टान्तः, यथा 'शायते नित्यगत्येव काट-स्यात्ययकारणम्'। निदर्शननिर्वचनयोरयं विशेषो यत् निदर्शनं मूर्खविदुषां बुद्धिसाम्यविषयो दृष्टान्तः। निर्वचनं तु पण्डितबुद्धिवेद्यमेव। किं वा नि-र्वचनं निरुक्तिर्यथा—'विविधं सर्पति यतो विसर्पस्तेन स्मृतः' इत्यादि (चक्र.)। गु॰त. शब्दनिष्पत्तिर्निर्वचनम् (को. अ.)।

३२ सन्नियोग. (नियोग.)—यदिदमेव कार्यं, नेदं कार्यमित्येव प्रेरणं नियोग। यथा—मात्राशी स्यात्; यथा च देवगोब्राह्मणगुरुवृद्ध-सिद्धाचार्यानर्चयेदित्येवमादिः (ग.)। अवश्यानुष्ठेयतया विधानम् (चक्र.)। एव नान्यथेति नियोगः (को. अ.)।

३३ विकल्पनं (विकल्पः)—दम वेति विशेषेण कल्पते तत्। यथा—मद्यमसं न वा वेदमय वा सुवदृकमिति। सुश्रुते च—इदं वेदं वेति विकल्पः (ग.)। अपेक्ष साध्यन्योमादानमलेदाहरणे दम इव दर्देनाभि बाधकेन बहुषु विकल्पदर्शनार्थम्। क्वचिद्वायन्द विनाऽपि विकल्पो

भवति (ह.)। विकल्पः पाक्षिकाभिधानम् (चक्र.)। अनेन वानेन वेति विकल्पः (कौ. अ.)।

*३४ प्रत्युच्चारः—यत्पूर्वमुच्चरित पुनस्तथैवोच्चार्यते (ग.)। प्रत्युच्चारो नाम परनिवारणम् (चक्र.)।

*३५ उद्धारः—यदुपदिष्टार्थमनुसृत्योद्धार्यते (ग.)। उद्धारो नाम परपक्षदूषणं दत्वा स्वपक्षोद्धारणं वा (चक्र.)।

*३६ सम्भवः—यो यतः सम्भवति स तस्य सम्भवः। यथा—दोषा व्याधीनां सम्भवः (ग.)। यद् यस्मिन् उपपद्यते स तस्य सम्भवो वा। यथा-मुखे व्यङ्गनीलिकादयः सम्भवन्तीत्यादि (चक्र.)।

[* एतच्चिह्नाङ्किता युक्तयः सुश्रुतसंहितायां कौटिलीयार्थशास्त्रे च न सन्ति।]

" भट्टारहरिश्चन्द्रेण चतस्रस्तन्त्रयुक्तयः परिप्रश्नव्याकरणव्युत्क्रान्ताभिधानहेत्वाख्या व्याहृताः। ताश्चैतास्वेव (षट्त्रिंशत्स्वेव) अन्तर्भावनीयाः। तत्र परिप्रश्न उद्देशेऽन्तर्भवति, व्याकरणं तु व्याख्याने। व्युत्क्रान्ताभिधानं निर्देशभेदः। हेतुशब्देन यानि प्रत्यक्षादीनि प्रमाणानि [न्यायशास्त्रे] उक्तानि तानि हेतावन्तर्भवन्ति। " (चक्र०)

एवं 'तन्त्र-(शास्त्र)-सारगवेषणे सम्यग्विनिहिताः', 'शब्दार्थन्यायसंयुताः', 'दीपीभूताः' तन्त्रयुक्तयः पदवाक्यप्रमाणजिज्ञासुभिर्विविधवद्वेदितव्याः। यद्यप्येताः सामान्यतो निखिलशास्त्रजातार्थनियोजनेऽतितरामुपयुक्तास्तथापि विशिष्टशास्त्रार्थावधारणे विशिष्टयुक्तीनामुपयोजनं मतिमद्योजकाधीनमेव। पुरातने काले यथा मौखिकाध्यापने, तथाऽर्थविवृतिपरे लिखिताध्यापनरूपे वा टीकावाङ्मयेऽप्येतासामुपयोजनं विशिष्टशास्त्रार्थविनिश्चयाय सङ्ख्यावद्भिरनुष्ठितपूर्वमेव। अतोऽधुनातनाध्यापनेऽप्यध्याप्यमानविशिष्टविषयसन्दर्भानुसारेणोपरितनतन्त्रयुक्तीनां यथासम्भवमुपयोजनं टीकावाङ्मयानुशीलनपूर्वकं विधेयमिति नैव पृथङ् निवेदनीयं प्रेक्षावज्जनेभ्यः। अनेनैवाभिप्रायेण सुश्रुते लिखितं, यथा—

सामान्यदर्शनेनासौ व्यवस्था सम्प्रदर्शिता।
विशेषस्तु यथायोगमुपधार्यो विपश्चिता॥ इति।

इत्थं शक्तिग्रहोपायभूताया विवृतेः सुरभारतीवाङ्मयोदधौ महत्त्वं समवबुध्यैव तद्विषये विस्तरतो व्याख्यानमत्र विहितम्।

(८) सिद्धपदसांनिध्यम्–प्रसिद्धपदस्य सांनिध्यमित्यष्टमः शक्तिग्रहोपायः। "प्रसिद्धपदस्य सांनिध्यादपि शक्तिग्रहो यथा–'इह सहकारतरौ मधुरं पिको रौति' इत्यादौ पिकशब्दस्य मधुरादिप्रसिद्धपदसांनिध्यात् कोकिले शक्तिग्रहः" (सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलिः)। प्रसिद्धपदसांनिध्यं सांनिध्यमात्रात्किञ्चिद्भिद्यते, तथापि सांनिध्यपदोच्चारणेनात्र वाक्यान्वयसाधनभूतं संनिधि–तच्च स्मृतिसरणिमायाति, संनिधिश्चात्र मीमांसकैकदेशिभिरभिहितान्वयवादिभिरुपदिष्टानामाकाङ्क्षा – योग्यता – संनिधीनां वाक्याङ्गभूतपदान्वयबोधयोगिनामुपलक्षणं भवति। आकाङ्क्षा–योग्यता–संनिधयश्च पुनः पदान्वयपुरस्सरं दण्डान्वयमुखेन, खण्डान्वयमुखेन वा वाक्यप्रकरणाद्यर्थमवगमयन्ति, ततो तात्पर्यवृत्त्या वाक्यमहावाक्यग्रन्थादिबोधाय क्रमशः सहायीभवन्तीति भाषातत्त्वान्यत्र सविशेषं स्मृतौ समायान्ति।

उपसंहारः।

एवमवस्थितमिदं प्रतीच्यदृष्ट्यवलम्ब्यपि प्राच्यभाषातत्त्वाधिष्ठितमभिनवं शक्तिग्रहोपायविवेचनम्। प्रतीच्यदृष्ट्यवलम्बस्तु प्राच्यप्रतीच्यभाषातत्त्वसमन्वयाय तदनन्तरं च भाषाध्ययनाध्यापनयोः प्रयोगविज्ञानसौकर्याय कृतः, न तु पाश्चात्यदृष्टेः श्रेयस्त्वसाधनायेति विभावनीयं प्रेक्षावद्भिः। यतः कस्यचिदाङ्ग्लीयविदुषो वचनानुरोधतः—

पाश्चात्यविदुषां नाहमृणी तद्ग्रन्थदर्पणात्।
यदस्मत्प्राक्तनेभ्यस्तैर्गृहीतर्णं विशुध्यते॥

इति रीत्या प्राच्यतत्त्वान्येवास्माकं जीवातुभूतानि। अथाष्टशक्तिग्रहोपायेषु व्याकरणव्यवहारविवृतयोऽन्येभ्यः शक्तिग्रहोपायेभ्यो विस्तृततरं विमर्शविषयं गताः, अधुनातनभाषाध्ययनेऽपि तत्तन्माहात्म्यस्य चिरस्थायित्वात्। आदौ तावद् व्याकरणं विस्तरेण विमर्शविषयीभूतम्। यद्यपि प्राच्यैर्व्याकरणं मुख्यत्वेनाङ्गीकृतं, तथापि गीर्वाणभाषापरिष्कृत्यनुरोधेन तस्मिन् सुबन्तकारकसमासादीनां प्राधान्यरूपमवतीर्णं, प्रकृतिप्रत्ययविच्छेदनपूर्विका

तिङन्तप्रधाना यौगिकी च पदरूपसिद्धिः क्रमेण कथं गौणत्वं प्राप्ता इत्येव व्याकरणविमर्शे प्रदर्शितम्। व्याकरणाध्यापने तु व्यावहारिकं प्रयोजनं प्राधान्यं भजते। सामान्यच्छात्रदृष्ट्या यौगिकार्थं बोधयत्प्रकृतिप्रत्ययादिविशिष्टं व्याकरणं प्रायो वाङ्मयाध्ययने निष्प्रयोजनं भवति, अपि च रूढार्थं बोधयतां सिद्धपदानां कारकसमासादिसम्बन्धमाविष्कुर्वद् व्याकरणं मनोव्यापाराधिष्ठितं सद् गीर्वाणभाषापरिवृत्त्यनुसारेण वाङ्मयबोधाय पर्याप्तमित्ययं शास्त्रिप्रवरैरेवानुसृतः सिद्धान्तोऽत्राग्रे स्थापितः। अवधेयमत्र यन्मीमांसकैर्विनियोगविधिविवेचने श्रुति–लिङ्ग–वाक्य–प्रकरण–स्थान–समाख्येत्येतेषां षट्प्रमाणानामुत्तरोत्तरं दुर्बलत्वं प्रस्थापितमिति। तेन समाख्यायाः (यौगिकार्थस्य) वाक्यार्थनिर्णये दुर्बलत्वं व्यक्तीभवति, 'लिङ्ग'स्य–रूढार्थस्यैव बलीयस्त्वं निर्णीतं भवति च। अयं सिद्धान्तो वाक्यघटितवाङ्मयार्थनिर्णये गुरुभिः सामान्यच्छात्राणां कृते सर्वदैव पुरतः स्थापनीयः। व्याकरणाध्यापने च तात्त्विकीं दृष्टिं परित्यज्य व्यावहारिकी दृष्टिः समाश्रयणीयेत्येव व्याकरणविमर्शसारः।

अनन्तरमस्मिन् शक्तिग्रहविवेचने व्यवहारस्य प्राधान्यं सविशेषं प्रतिष्ठापितं, यतः प्रतीच्यभाषातत्त्वविद इव प्राच्यभाषातत्त्वज्ञा अपि मनोविज्ञानाधिष्ठितस्य 'व्यवहार'स्य सर्वमूर्धन्यत्वं 'शक्तिग्राहकशिरोमणित्वं' वा समकण्ठघोषमेव प्रख्यापयन्ति। अत्रैव प्रतीच्यानां सवादपद्धतेर्व्यवहारेण साकं साम्यं सल्लक्ष्यते, न किञ्चिदप्यत्र प्रतीच्येभ्यः प्राच्यैर्नूतनमध्यापनतत्त्वमधिगन्तव्यमिति सुष्ठु दृष्टं स्यात्।

तदनु विवृतिविमर्शोऽस्मिन्प्रबन्धेऽन्यशक्तिग्रहोपायेभ्योऽप्यधिकतरां विस्तृतिं प्राप्तः। विवृतेर्निदर्शनं टीकापदवाच्यलिखितव्याख्यानरूपेण गीर्वाणवाङ्मये भृशं लभ्यते। पुरा समीचीनव्याख्यातारोऽध्यापकाः किंलक्षणा आसन्स्तथा तेषां मौखिकव्याख्यानरीतिः कियद्विधा प्रचलिता, के तस्या गुणविशेषाः, ते विशेषाः पुनरद्यत्वे शास्त्रिप्रवराणां मौखिकव्याख्याने (अध्यापने) कियदंशेनाधिगम्यन्ते, व्याख्यानपद्धतेः कान्यधिष्ठानभूतानि भाषातत्त्वानि, तानि भाषातत्त्वानि समवलम्ब्य ते ते व्याख्यानगुणा यथा बालानां तथा प्रौढानामधुनातनाध्यापनेऽपि कथं सम्पादनीया इति सर्वमपि

विवृतिविमर्शे सुविज्ञातं भवेत् । एतदर्थं ज्ञान च गुरुशिष्यमति टीकावाङ्मयानुशीलने नियोजयेत् । तथा हि 'आत्मसरया क्रिया', 'सङ्क्रान्ति' श्चेति पुरातनाध्यापकाना गुणद्वय यथा कालिदासेन मालविकाग्निमित्रनाटके परिगणित तथा सुश्रुतेऽपि व्याख्यातुरायुर्वेदाध्यापकस्योभयज्ञत्व (शास्त्रज्ञत्व तथा कर्मज्ञत्वं) मतिमत्त्वम् (ऊहापोहक्षमत्वं) चेति गुणाः कथिताः ते यथा—

> यस्तूभयज्ञो मतिमान् स समर्थोऽर्थसाधने ।
> आहवे कर्म निर्वोढुं द्विचक्रः स्यन्दनो यथा ॥ इति ।

ईदृग्गुणसम्पन्नेन गुरुणा पुनः शिष्याणा पुरतो मुखतो व्याख्यानं कथमनुष्ठेयमित्यत्र विषये सुश्रुते वचनानि यथा—

"अथ वत्स ! तदेतदध्येयं यथा तथोपधारय मया प्रोच्यमानम्–अथ शुचये कृतोत्तरासङ्गाय (गृहीतोत्तरीयवस्त्राय) अव्याकुलाय (एकचित्ताय) उपस्थितायाध्ययनकाले शिष्याय यथाशक्ति (शिष्यस्य शक्त्यनतिक्रमेण, ग्रहणसामर्थ्यानुकूल्येन) गुरुरुपदिशेत् पदं (स्याद्यन्त त्याद्यन्त वा), पाद (श्लोकचतुर्थांश), श्लोकं (चतुष्पादपरिपूर्णं) वा । ते च पदपादश्लोका भूयः क्रमेणानुसन्धेयाः [तथा हि–पदेन पादः, पदपादाभ्या श्लोकः सन्धानीयः] । एवमेकैकशो घटयेदात्मना चानुपठेत् [एकमेकं प्रति शिष्य योजनिका कारयेत्, शिष्यस्य पश्चादाचार्यः स्वयं पठेत्, शिष्यस्य सुखपठनार्थम्] । अद्रुतमविलम्बितमविशङ्कितमननुनासिकं व्यक्ताक्षरमपीडितवर्णं (वर्णमपीडयन्) अक्षिभ्रुवौष्ठहस्तैरनभिनीतं सुसंस्कृत नात्युच्चैर्नातिनीचैश्च स्वरैः पठेत्" ॥ इति ।

इय व्याख्यानपद्धतिष्टीकाग्रन्थगताया दण्डान्वयपद्धतेर्मौलिकमाद्यस्वरूपमित्यत्र विज्ञेयम् । दण्डान्वये नैयायिकमतानुसारेण वाक्यगतं कर्तृपदमादौ गृहीत्वा तदनुक्रमेण वाक्यस्थपदान्वयपूर्वकमर्थविवृतिः क्रियते । इयमेव रीतिरुपर्युपस्थापिता । खण्डान्वयपद्धतिस्त्वत्र न वर्णिता । प्राचीनकालादारभ्याद्य यावत्तावज्जग्राहयदिमाप्यद्येत्यनुरोधेन परिशुद्धिं गता प्रश्नोत्तरपद्धतिरेव 'किमो रूपं पुरस्कृत्य' खण्डान्वयरूपेणाचरतनटीका-

अन्येष्ववतीर्णा। अस्या पद्धत्या मीमांसकरीत्या क्रियापदमादौ गृहीत्वा तदनु कारकानुरोधेनोत्थिताकाङ्क्षाद्वारोत्थाप्याकाङ्क्षाद्वारैव वाक्यस्थानामवशिष्टपदानामन्वयविवृती क्रियेते। 'व्यवहार'-सहकृतैषा खण्डान्वयपद्धतिः प्रतीच्यानां संवादपद्धतेः सुतरां साधर्म्यमापन्ना, बालप्रौढानामध्यापनेऽद्यत्वेऽपि परमहितकारित्वादनुसरणयोग्येत्ययं विषयोऽत्र सस्मरणीयः।

इदं व्याख्यानपद्धतिद्वयं गुरुणा किमर्थमनुविधेयम? तर्हि "चतुर्भिः प्रकारैर्विद्योपयुक्ता भवति–आगमकालेन स्वाध्यायकालेन प्रवचनकालेन व्यवहारकालेन" इति (पात. म. भा.)। तथा च "अधिगतमप्यध्ययनमप्रभावितमर्थतः (अर्थतोऽव्याख्यातम्) खरस्य चन्दनभार इव केवलपरिश्रमकरं भवति। भवति चात्र—

यथा खरश्चन्दनभारवाही भारस्य वेत्ता न तु चन्दनस्य।

एवं हि शास्त्राणि बहून्यधीत्य चार्थेषु मूढाः खरवद्वहन्ति॥–"

तस्माज्ज्ञानस्याविरतपरम्परासंरक्षणाय शिष्यप्रशिष्यानुक्रमेण तदुपरितनरीत्या मौखिकाध्यापनरूपेण लेखगताध्यापनरूपेण (विवृतिटीकादिभि.) सन्तत व्याख्येयमन्यथा तदसफलप्रयोजनं भवतीत्यर्थोऽत्र साकल्येन समुदेति। ज्ञानक्षायुक्रमे ज्ञानमादौ मुखनिविष्टव्याख्यानद्वारा तदनु च लेखनिविष्टव्याख्यानद्वारा सुस्थिरं भवति। यद्वा क्षर मुखव्याख्यानमेव लिखितव्याख्यारूपेणाविर्भूयाक्षरविग्रहवद्भवति। अतो विवृतिव्याख्यानप्रभाष्यप्रवचनाद्यपरपर्यायाष्टीकाग्रन्थाः पूर्वतनमौखिकाध्यापनरीतीनां निदर्शनानि भूत्वा सद्गतगुणगवेषणायोत्तरतनाध्यापनपद्धतेः रुचिरत्वापादनाय च कल्पन्ते। एतदर्थमेव शक्तिग्रहोपायभूता विवृतिरत्र सविस्तरं व्याख्याता।

अपि च प्रधानभूतायां विवृतावन्ये सर्वेऽपि शक्तिग्रहोपाया गौणत्वं भजमानाः स्वस्वस्थानमधिगत्य चरितार्था भवन्ति। तथा हि–सर्वशास्त्रोपकारकं व्याकरणं धातुप्रकृतिप्रत्ययविच्छेदनविशिष्टया पदसाधनिकारूपया च स्वीयपदार्थज्ञानरीत्या यथा मौखिकव्याख्यानस्य तथा लिखितव्याख्यानस्याप्युपकुरुते। तथा च प्रतिपाद्यविषयस्य चारुत्वमापादयदुपमानं, व्याकरणसंस्कृतोऽमरादिकृतपङ्क्तिभिरवतारितश्च कोशः, शक्तताभियुक्त-

मीमांसकाना शाब्दबोधपद्धतिं प्रदर्शयन्ति। तद्यथा-आप्तवाक्यं तु शब्दप्रमाणमेव । व्यवहारः पुनर्मीमांसकैकदेशिभिरन्विताभिधानवादिभिर्वाक्यबोधपुरस्सरपदबोध्यत्वेन सकण्ठरवमुद्घोषितः । अभिहितान्वयवादिमीमांसकाना मत च पदबोधपुरस्सर वाक्यार्थे पर्यवस्यतीवाक्यशेषसिद्धिपदसांनिध्यरूपयोः सवितप्रदीपायर्योर्निलीनमिति प्रतीयते ।

इत्थ समग्रवितप्रदीपायाः सर्वसारग्राहिण्यो विवृतावन्तर्भूय प्रमाणचतुष्टयबलेन ता द्रढयन्ति । अत्र टीकावाङ्मयान्तर्हित पौरस्त्यानां भाषाध्ययनाध्यापनविषयकं पद्धतिशास्त्रमेवाऽऽविष्कृतमस्माभिः । नात्र मन्तव्य यदखिलमपि विवृतिवाङ्मय मूलग्रन्थापेक्षि परतन्त्र चेति । पराक्षेपनिरासपूर्वकं स्वोपज्ञमत विस्तारयन्तो भाष्यग्रन्था, तत्सदृशा अन्ये वा रसादिसमीक्षापरा टीकाप्रबन्धा मूलग्रन्थमाहात्म्यमेवाऽऽपन्ना मूलग्रन्था इवाम्यसनार्हाः सञ्जाता इत्यत्र विषये निदर्शनोपन्यासो नापक्ष्यते । ज्ञानाप्राधान्ये ज्ञानसातत्ये च सविशेष दृग्विषयीकृते, ' अय मूलग्रन्थः ' ' अय टीकाग्रन्थः ' इति भेदो नैव नयनसरणिमायाति । तथापि मूलग्रन्थमहत्त्वाधायको मूलप्रतिबिम्बरूपः सरलसुबोधो विषयविस्तारो, मूलार्थस्यैव सामीचीन्येन प्रतिपादन बोधन वा टीकाग्रन्थाना मुख्य प्रयोजनम् । अतष्टीकावाङ्मयानुशीलनमधुनातनगीर्वाणभाषाध्यापनेऽपि मूलग्रन्थस्य विषयरहस्य सम्यगवबोध्य च्छात्राणा सत्यज्ञानरुचि सवर्ध्य च भाषाज्ञानस्य, दृढपरिपाकायापि कल्पेत। अद्यतनाऽऽङ्ग्लभाषागतटीकाटिप्पण्यादिभ्योऽपि सस्कृतटीकानुशीलनमवश्यमधिकतर बोधमुत्पादयेदिति नैव विस्मरणीयम्। एव समग्रवितप्रदीपायभूतैः स्रोतोभिः परिपूरिता, पदवाक्यप्रमाणरूपाभिस्तिसृभिस्तरङ्गिणीभिश्च परिवर्धितेव विवृतिमन्दाकिनी गीर्वाणवाङ्मयप्रदेशेऽद्यावदविरत वहन्ती गमीरज्ञानोदधिजलसङ्गमेन कृतार्था सञ्जाता । अतो गुरुशिष्यास्तस्याः कूलमध्यास्य मूलग्रन्थैः साक तस्या मधुर जलमाकण्ठ संसेव्य च पूतचित्ता जायेरन्, विवृतिवाङ्मय तद्बोधक्रमरूपं पद्धतिशास्त्र चेत्येतयोरनुशीलनेन सुरभारत्याः साङ्गोपाङ्ग ज्ञानमधिगम्य सन्तत तस्याः सार्वोत्रिकाय समुत्कर्षाय प्रयतेरन्नित्याशास्य विरम्यते ॥

—×—

The Problem of Sanskrit Teaching
[संस्कृतानुशीलनविवेकः ।]

Part II

THE CLASSICS *versus* THE MODERN SUBJECTS

The value of a classical language like Sanskrit as an aid to culture is unquestionable; but its immediate utilitarian value for serving the daily needs of life is seriously questioned by persons of a practical bent of mind. Psychological investigations have again acknowledged " Individual Differences " and pointed out that an average pupil constituting the majority has less aptitude for a classical language than for practical subjects like handwork, drawing, carpentry etc Nay, a vast majority of pupils have been found to have a very weak linguistic ability, i e they have no aptitude even for learning a modern language like French, English, German, etc . Hence it is suggested by some that a highly inflected classical language like Sanskrit, should, on account of its inherent difficulty, be either dropped altogether from the 'curriculum or be made optional On the other hand, the advocates of classical learning are trying their utmost to maintain the position of Sanskrit as a compulsory subject for all A big controversy was raised over this problem in the West, and the advocates of modern subjects have won in the end. Thus in the Western countries the classical languages are gradually receding from the curriculum, and are studied only by a chosen few who have an aptitude for them. The same thoughts are echoed by those

Indian educationists who in imitation of the Westerners, have changed the University curriculum first by making the classical languages optional and then by combining the classical and modern languages under *one* head It is interesting to note here how the Classicists and the Modernists, the two parties in the West as well as in India try to defend their own position and refute the view of the other party by putting forth various arguments

When the *Classicists* maintain that acquaintance with the fundamentals of ancient culture enshrined in the classical languages is the *sine qua non* of complete education, the *Modernists* answer that the study of modern literature alone will suffice since the same ancient culture has been absorbed in the modern languages If again, any one is more interested in that culture he should read the translations of the classical works

The *Classicists* reply to this argument by asserting that the first hand knowledge and intimate appreciation of the master minds of old can in no way be compared to the second hand knowledge from translations Translation can never be an adequate substitute for the original Though the subjectmatter of a literary work is in some way translatable the enchanting manner or the unique style of a particular author is untranslatable Prose rather than poetry is, perhaps, translatable, though with partial loss of the original beauty Nobody, therefore, would rest satisfied unless he drank deep at the original fountain

The *Modernists* argue against this that the immediate needs of the present must be looked to,

and that the study of modern sciences and training in citizenship are more useful than the classics.

The *Classicists* refute this argument by stating that the present has no meaning apart from the past and the future. As the present is ever linked to the past and the future, there must be continuity in the experiences of the three.

It can further be added that there need be no hostility between the modern sciences and the classics, since science exists in the forms of medicine, chemistry, astronomy, mathematics, architecture, logic, grammar, etymology, politics, economics, law, etc., even in Sanskrit. Modern sciences need not sever their connection with the ancient ones if the latter are even now useful in their own way and supply data for further research. Here, those Indians who deprecate ancient sciences and advocate the utilitarian value of modern sciences to the detriment of the classics should be asked to consider how much of modern science they have been able to collect under the present educational system, and whether that amount of knowledge has proved adequate to the solution of the difficult problem of the daily bread. They must know that the ideas of citizenship, politics and law are found embedded in the स्मृतिs, the अर्थशास्त्र of कौटिल्य and the महाभारत, all of which are indispensable for the comparative study of those subjects as treated of in modern works. Moreover, the study of Medicine (आयुर्वेद), Law (धर्मशास्त्र), Politics (नीतिशास्त्र), etc., the utilitarian value of which is indisputable even at present, is calculated to be more fruitful, if all of them are studied through Sanskrit. The study of the Hindu Law, as it is

carried on in the Law Course in a roundabout manner through English translations, not only entails much loss of energy on the part of the students, but gives them vague impressions, unless they try to understand the Hindu outlook and the import of original words in Sanskrit works

Again, some classicists basing their arguments on the Faculty Psychology maintain that the classics provide a better mental gymnastic than the other subjects do, that the various faculties of the mind, viz, memory, attention, reasoning, observation, etc, are well trained by exercises in translation, rules for the formation of nouns and verbs in grammar, and rote learning

The *modern psychologists* prove the hollowness of this theory of "mental training", "formal training", "*transfer of training*" or "*intellectual* discipline", as it is, variously designated The Faculty Psychology which has lost sight of the necessary unity of the mind by treating the various aspects or functions of the same mind as separate faculties, but which holds its sway over common people, has *been discredited* by modern psychologists The underlying principle of this theory of "Transfer of training" is that if a man exercises a specific faculty in a specific way, he develops the power of that faculty *in general*, i e for any kind of mental activity *For instance*, if the verbal or rote memory is exercised, the power of memory in general is developed. In other words, the specific training in rote memory can be transferred to the other activities of memory in a wider sphere But there are various functions of the general memory, as "verbal memory", "*true memory*" (memory for a series of ideas) etc, and Thorndyke

has experimentally proved that no transference of the one to the other is possible. If a man has developed his 'verbal-mechanical-rote' memory, there is no evidence to say that this activity is transferable to the functions of "true memory," which depends upon the understanding of relations and interest.

The same can be said of other faculties such as observation, attention, reasoning, etc.. We have no adequate ground to say that careful observation of grammatical forms in a classical language like Sanskrit will make a pupil more observant in general. For, observation also depends upon understanding and interest. We observe only such things as matter to us—as interest us In translation a pupil has to think out, sometimes by inference, the accurate meaning of words in a sentence We cannot, however, say with certainty that he will use this sense of "accuracy" in other departments of knowledge where he is not required to translate Training in reasoning, which the process of translation is supposed to bring about, is also a specific training in the choice of words and in the observance of the rules of syntax, and it cannot be transferred to the forms of true reasoning which proceeds from cause to effect There are various types of reasoning and only a specific reasoning power is developed instead of the general one in translation True reasoning is developed by the study of logic and reading of books in the mother tongue rather than by the classical studies Accuracy, reasoning, attention, observation, memory, etc, can be developed by several other subjects besides tho classics Again, attention which is forced and without interest does not result in any kind of fruitful w

but intellectual effort coupled with feeling and interest is bound to lead one to success Thus, Experimental Psychology has demonstrated the futility of the theory of " mental gymnastic " or " intellectual discipline " The modern psychologists admit, however, that a slight transference is possible in cases where there are identical elements, allied languages or subjects, common content, or correlation of studies With full faith in this theory of " intellectual discipline ' some classicists lay stress on the formal rather than on the functional study of grammar which becomes a drudgery to the pupils of tender age If the training thus received is, as indicated above, specific, the theory of ' intellectual discipline cannot be said to stand on a firm footing

Although the psychological truth of the foregoing argument be avowed we find discrepancy in its advocacy of the study of logic instead of the classics for the development of " reasoning " What-ever might be the case of Western Logic, we think that the study of Indian Logic cannot be properly conducted except through Sanskrit In spite of the existence of vernacular and English translations of some Sanskrit manuals of logic, the same Sanskrit logical terms have to be used in explanation, and ultimately, if any portions of the original manual can be translated into the mother tongue or English, they are only the Sanskrit inflections and a few minor words We shall have thus to acknowledge the fact that the knowledge of Sanskrit is indispensable for the proper understanding and study of Indian Logic at least Even the best translations of Sanskrit works on Logic do not much enlighten us, unless we approach the original, for

the understanding of which the knowledge of Sanskrit has to be presupposed In short, logic cannot be divorced from Sanskrit

The *classicists* again maintain on the basis of the theory of "Intellectual Discipline" that the very difficulty of the classics is a valuable aid to the training of the mind The harder a subject, the closer the attention that has to be paid to it, and the longer is it remembered

The *modern psychologists* say here that even after realising the inherent difficulty of Sanskrit, the formal study of its grammar in the initial stage can on no account be defended, and that no person can be forced to attend to a difficult subject, unless that subject matters to him-interests him. Solution of a difficulty or a problem interests a pupil, if there is proper motivation or the placing of a worthy aim before him The humanistic aspect of language-study places a worthy aim before young pupils rather than the formal one Moreover, a difficulty, if it is really worthy of solution, awakens intrinsic interest and further leads one to spontaneous work and progress, but it must be distinguished from bewilderment which is due to the inherent dryness of a subject and leads one nowhere. This makes quite clear that the incessant grinding at grammatical forms in the absence of a worthy goal-the enjoyment of literature-is bound to create disgust in the minds of juvenile students Of course, it is partially true that every subject is difficult in the beginning, that enforced attention to it is occasionally necessary, and that intrinsic interest in it can be aroused gradually and not all at once. *It is also true that some time in the beginning* has to be devoted to the mastering of the

fundamentals of language before pupils come into touch with rich ideas in literature Yet there is no reason why this mastering of fundamentals alone should be continued for years together and why ideas in literature should not be introduced side by side with the formal study of language The benefits of studying Sanskrit, according to the present system can be had only at an advanced stage Pupils of tender age, therefore, cannot but grow impatient, when the study of literature is unnecessarily postponed by an indefinite period, and when they are made to plod their weary way over non-essential grammatical technicalities as preparatory to the future joy

The *classicists* again affirm that the classics have stood the test of time and that nothing but the best has to be studied in them On the other hand, modern literature is full of trash from which it is difficult to select a work of considerable merit

The *modernists* retort against this by stating that the ancient literature is narrow in its outlook and not varied or wide like the modern one The ancient authors did not even dream of the engaging problems and questions discussed in modern literature, and those problems are of more direct interest and use to us If again, modern literature is full of trash, ancient literature is not devoid of it

We must admit here that Sanskrit literature is not without a little trash yet we cannot say that it is not varied When the European Sanskritists have ungrudgingly acknowledged the variety of Sanskrit literature in thought and form and also its substantial contribution to the various departments of knowledge, the modernists simply betray their ignorance of Sanskrit in underrating it as narrow in out-

look The present day problems are, no doubt, of more direct interest to us, yet it is unjust to say that none of them was dreamt of in ancient times. If history repeats itself, and if human nature is everywhere the same, we need not doubt that at least some of the present day problems once held the attention of ancient people in a different form. Is it not then desirable to seek solutions of the modern problems in similar situations or thoughts as recorded in ancient literature? Would it then be wise on our part to ignore Sanskrit literature which is our national heritage?

The *modernists* still declare that the classics are after all dead languages 'None will be the loser for being ignorant of them' On account of their inherent difficulty there is a very small return in proportion to the time and energy wasted over their study

The *classicists* object to this assertion and say that the terms 'dead' and 'living' are relative Generally the languages that have ceased to be spoken are termed as 'dead', and this might be true in the case of Greek and Latin This false analogy is not applicable to Sanskrit which is not so dead to the Hindus as Greek and Latin are to the Europeans In the first place Sanskrit was once a spoken language and is still the language of our sacraments Secondly, Sanskrit Pundits of the different parts of India are even now found to converse, write works and conduct periodicals in *Sanskrit* on varied subjects Thirdly a considerable number of poor students deprived of the benefits of English education are still studying Sanskrit alone in Pathashalas and Sanskrit Colleges scattered over all parts of India They are further

availing themselves of the Oriental Title Examinations conducted by *the Government* and the *bodies* of Pundits *through the medium of Sanskrit*, and are solving the problem of the daily bread in their own way Is it not then far from being true to call Sanskrit 'dead' and 'useless'? If it be objected that this *activity is limited only to a small field, can* we not say *the same in the case* of English education? When the percentage of literacy in India does not exceed 9, how small must be the number of people knowing English? Is it then wrong to *say that affairs conducted in English, notwithstanding the spread of English education, are limited* only to the English-knowing Indians who have been alienated from the vast population of India? Is not *then English relatively dead to the masses? Even* in the case of educated people we may state that English is not so 'living' to them as it is to the English people, it *being their mother tongue* Generally the literary form of English is known by educated Indians rather than the colloquial one, which is known only by those that have lived in England *Moreover, taking into account the number of periods consumed by English in the time-table* of educational institutions, the number of years devoted to its study and the surrender value of that study, no one can affirm that Sanskrit is more difficult than English If the utilitarian value of Sanskrit is *questioned, then we may ask* What is the market value of English education received at so great a cost? Does it bring returns adequate to the time, money and energy we spend over it? Of course, the international importance of the English *language as a means of keeping* oneself in *touch with world affairs and of enriching modern*

Indian literatures with new material cannot be disowned yet it should occupy an equal number of periods in the time table with Sanskrit or any second language and the mother tongue

Sanskrit, not being a foreign language like English or a dead language like Greek and Latin to Indians, *can be more easily learned by them than* English, since many of the modern Indian languages have been derived from or influenced by Sanskrit, since they contain about a half of their words directly taken (तत्सम) or derived (तद्भव) from Sanskrit, and since their structure also mostly depends on that of Sanskrit Moreover, to suit our present needs we are coming continuously from Sanskrit new तत्सम words and technical terms to be made current in our mother tongue Are we not then in a way treating Sanskrit as a 'living' language, though only in the case of isolated words? If one would minutely observe the characteristics of modern Indian Languages, one would not fail to note the tendency in them to be more and more Sanskritised *When Hindus are so much drawing* upon the immortal store of Sanskrit as regards their mother tongues and culture, they at least cannot *afford to* be without a modicum of it *Of course*, the supposed difficulty of Sanskrit can be removed by improving the methods of its teaching and bringing concreteness and the human touch in its study. The study of Sanskrit thus not only helps the intelligent grasp of the mother tongue but is also indispensable for the correct and refined expression in the tongue and for etymological insight into words in the higher stages of *the study* The ear of a classical scholar is keenly sensitive to the real meanings and subtle shades of words and sentences.

The study of the classics, therefore, is especially beneficial to literary aspirants and journalists in the mother tongue

The *modernists* doubt the truth of this *statement* and add that a close study of authors in the mother tongue alone would make one proficient in it. Preferably an *etymological turn may be given* to the study of the mother tongue for which no detailed study of Sanskrit is required

The *classicists* refute this argument by advocating the urgent *necessity* of possessing the knowledge of Sanskrit at least upto the Matriculation Examination for learning well the mother tongue, the Prakrits or any modern Indian language like Hindi, Bengali, *etc*, since all of them depend *more or less upon* Sanskrit as regards their vocabulary and structure To deny the claims of even this minimum of Sanskrit for *the study of languages derived from Sanskrit is to* build an edifice on sands The separation of the mother tongue from Sanskrit by offering the former *as an option for the latter, or the combination of both* under one head in the school stage, as the University of Bombay has several times capriciously done, is a suicidal policy, which not only does an injustice to Sanskrit, but results in the desultory knowledge even of the mother tongue, to which the incorrect Marathi written by the present graduates and journalists will testify The writer knows from his own experience that students knowing Sanskrit write more correct Marathi than those studying Marathi to the exclusion of Sanskrit He has, moreover, noticed that some modern Marathi authors, who had been deprived of the benefits of learning Sanskrit, *had ever by their side Sanskrit dictionaries* for looking up apt words to be used in their Marathi

writings, but who, being ignorant of the suitability and context of those words in the Sanskrit language, sometimes used, due to this dictionary habit, such words as would be obscure even to Sanskritists! It should further be noted that certain ancient authors use a high percentage of Sanskrit words in their works in the mother tongue, and cannot be understood and appreciated well unless a minimum amount of Sanskrit is known All these facts will prove beyond doubt the necessity of knowing, at least, as much of Sanskrit as should be known by a Matriculate

Etymological study of the mother tongue cannot be relished by students unless they are equipped with this amount of the knowledge of Sanskrit In other words, the etymological aspect of language-study which in the main splits words into their components (प्रकृति and प्रत्यय) is an analytical process likely to disgust young pupils whose study of language must first be synthetic and then analytic. To explain further, ready-made forms of words as they occur in language should, for a few first years, be treated as independent words and learned in their synthetic form, attention being concentrated on the ideas in the language Occasional reference to the etymology of particular words may be made gradually according to the growing understanding of pupils yet too big a dose of etymology in the initial stage is sure to retard the progress of students When the etymological teaching of Sanskrit is abhorred even by young pupils taking Sanskrit, it need hardly be added how much boring it would be to students ignorant of Sanskrit Really speaking, the etymological study of language is suited only to the advanced stage and may be

commenced with advantage in the senior years of college education when etymological interest is likely to grow among students This remark may also apply to the study of the Prakrits which provide us with a valuable clue to the etymological and historical development of the mother tongue But unless there is sufficient grounding in Sanskrit upto the matriculation standard neither the advanced study of the mother tongue nor that of the Prakrits is likely to thrive

The *modernists* nevertheless contend that the present curriculum of the Indian Universities is predominantly linguistic and that three languages the mother tongue English and a classical language being required to be studied *none can be mastered* *They further add that the pressing demand of Hindi as a national language must be supplied by prescribing it in the curriculum* and that Sanskrit should make room for it According to them the mother tongue English and Hindi being utilitarian subjects must be compulsory but a classical language like Sanskrit which has no utility and does not help the study of the mother tongue should be banished from the curriculum so that more time can be devoted to the mother tongue the neglect of which has seriously affected the study of English

The *classicists* maintain that the curriculum of the Faculty of Arts in the Universities of any country is bound to be predominantly linguistic that is to say it is generally found to make provisions for *three languages viz the mother tongue a modern foreign language and a classical language* If none of these languages can be mastered the fault lies in the educational policy and the methods of teaching employed Why then crowd this curriculum

with technical subjects, which should find sufficient scope in special institutes or other Faculties? Furthermore, the utilitarian value of English has already been discussed above and there are no two opinions as to the importance of the mother tongue. If the neglect of the mother tongue is said to affect the teaching of a foreign language like English, it is really hard to understand how, according to the modernists, the study of Sanskrit *does not help* the study of the mother tongue which is closely related to it! It can be affirmed here that the systematic study of the mother tongue in the primary and secondary stages not only prepares the pupils for the introduction of Sanskrit and facilitates its study, but is, in return, *substantially assisted* by the growing knowledge of Sanskrit.

If Sanskrit is not a utilitarian subject, the utilitarianism, as meant by the modernists, is nothing less than the 'Bread-and-Butter' aim and hence is very narrow in outlook. To earn one's living is not, of course, an unworthy aim, but this is not the only aim in life. We are born not merely to *live*, but we live for nobler aims which can be achieved by our acquaintance with the ancient culture along with the modern one. Direct contact with Sanskrit makes the former possible. If, again, Sanskrit is not directly useful in after-life, how much useful are algebra, geometry and higher mathematics—the other subjects in the curriculum? It is difficult to understand why Sanskrit alone should be an eye-sore to the modernists posing to be educationists!

The demand of a national language like Hindi need not be underestimated. Yet, there is no necessity of prescribing Hindi as a regular subject in the curriculum which is already over-crowded.

The knowledge of Sanskrit upto the matriculation *standard is sure to help one to learn in a short* time Hindi or any modern Indian language derived from Sanskrit, independently of schooling The writer himself could, with the immense help of Sanskrit, acquire ability to understand and appreciate Bengali literature within the period of six months This personal experience will, perhaps, be *of some use to those who are so keen on the intro*duction of Hindi in the curriculum The banishment of Sanskrit from the curriculum is no real remedy for widening the scope of the mother tongue and English or providing for Hindi

Apart from the utilitarian value in its narrowest sense the cultural value of Sanskrit is inestimable For, in its comprehensive sense, what is 'cultural' is ultimately 'utilitarian', and life would not be worth living without culture The influence exerted by Sanskrit literature over the thoughts, customs *and manners of the various ancient nations of Asia* was considerable and that exerted over modern European scholars, specially interested in the Vedic and linguistic studies is great They are convinced of the fact that Sanskrit literature is the oldest monument of Indo-European culture Its distinctly ethical tone ennobles an individual, builds his *character and provides him with a clear outlook* on life Besides, the aesthetic or artistic branch of that literature carries a profound appeal, trains the *imagination of the reader by making him live, for* some time in the rich past and thus helps him to be lifted–at least for the time above, to a high plane of existence

The modernists, however, aver that there are several means, other than the classics, of enriching

our aesthetic and imaginative life Let the interest of pupils be awakened in the fine arts like music, painting, etc, which are easier of access to ordinary people than the study of the classics

The *classicists* here agree that the fine arts enrich the aesthetic life of man, yet they differ from the *modernists* in thinking that the words 'easy of access' and 'ordinary people' would admit of other interpretations also What is easy of access to a rich person might not be so to a person of ordinary means while what is easy of access to a person with sufficient mental outfit will not be so to a person of less than ordinary mental equipment. Thus those who are unwilling to put in even the least amount of intellectual effort, but are materially better off may take to music, painting, etc, which entail much expenditure, while those, who cannot afford to spend on them but are willing to exert themselves mentally, will study the classics and enrich their aesthetic life by enjoying the poetry contained in them Moreover, if the fine arts like music and painting add to our aesthetic joy, more so does poetry, which is also a fine art more removed from physical things than the other arts are The farther we are removed from the physical aspect of Beauty, the higher is our aesthetic delight. There is then no reason why the classical literature, which contains some of the best poetry of the world, should not be studied for the highest delight. One more thing must be remembered that poetry and music being sister arts, music will sometimes heighten the enjoyment of poetry Furthermore, in Sanskrit there are valuable scientific works on music painting sculpture, etc, the original study of which would immensely help persons interested

in them In addition to the fine arts there are also many useful arts, which have been enumerated to be *sixty-four*. Scattered references to them in Sanskrit literature or independent Sanskrit manuals on them, would supply data for doing much constructive work, in the absence of which those arts have become obsolete and are now supposed to be non-existent

If it is agreed, say the *modernists*, that those who are unwilling to exert themselves mentally should take to subjects other than the classics, it inevitably follows that the classics cannot be made compulsory for all For, in the first place, a large majority of the pupils of average abilities and insufficient means cannot continue their education after the Matriculation Examination, and consequently they have not the good fortune of receiving the benefits of classical learning which can be availed of only in colleges In England, the pupils continuing college education are 6 per cent only, and those entering the Faculty of Arts are 3per cent. only In India the percentage of students getting the chance of college education must be still lower than this Secondly, many students of this majority are not so linguistically minded as to feel a liking for the classics This fact proves beyond doubt that a large majority of students have more aptitude for taking 'technical subjects', and that only a select few have the aptitude for classical languages Thirdly, the non-Hindus are less inclined to take Sanskrit than other languages All such students-and their number is not inconsiderable-will have to be excluded from the number of students learning Sanskrit It is, therefore impossible to prescribe Sanskrit as a compulsory subject for all

The partial truth, say the *classicists,* of the impossibility of making Sanskrit a compulsory subject, may be admitted, but on the basis of modern psychology, they contradict some of the fallacious arguments put forth by the modernists The assumption of the modernists that all pupils do not possess the same degree of linguistic ability, is largely grounded on their faith in heredity According to the theory of Heredity, differences among individuals are held to be innate and cannot be accounted for except by assuming that they have been transmitted from generation to generation But recent scientific researches demonstrate that the theory of the transmission of hereditary characteristics cannot be conclusively proved The fact is that individual tendencies that are popularly credited to family heredity are mainly due to social heredity or environment Some allowance may, of course, be made for the transmission of family traits yet the environment, in which an individual is brought up has a greater influence over his development than mere heredity has Thus the argument of innate linguistic ability cannot stand to scrutiny If proper environment is provided, habits of clear and correct speech can be cultivated If the children of backward classes, who have rare opportunities for correct speech, are supplied with a suitable environment, they develop the language sense to a high degree The weak linguistic ability found among a majority of average pupils is more due to their uncongenial home conditions, while the better linguistic ability of the pupils of advanced classes owes its credit to their linguistically favourable surroundings If the modernists maintain that they alone, who have a better linguistic ability,

Shastras Among them there are two traditional ways regarding the order in which grammar and literature should be taught to beginners While the Pandits of Northern India are in favour of beginning the study of Sanskrit with 'लक्षण' or grammar as a science and introducing literature afterwards those of Southern India favour the teaching of 'लक्ष्य' or literature first, accompanied by the minimum of practical grammar necessary for its und-rstanding Of course in the Deccan the study of grammar as a science through the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी follows the study of literature It will thus be seen that the method of the Southern Pandits is more in keeping with the modern principles of language-study, and also the Pandits of Northern India have begun to acknowledge its efficacy and superiority in juvenile teaching

From the child's point of view, a flaw that is supposed to exist in the Shastri method is that in the very beginning pupils are made to undergo the process of learning by rote the शब्दरूपावलि, समासचक्र, अमरकोश, धातुरूपावलि (in some cases), and a few स्तोत्र and सुभाषित This course goes on for about six months, after which the study of literature begins The utility of this memorization is realised by pupils later on when they actually begin to study literature Though the study of literature helps them afterwards to assimilate with comprehension what they have learned formerly by rote, the procedure in the initial stage is somewhat unintelligent and tedious

Yet this flaw need not be much magnified Even if we take into consideration the up-to-date researches in Experimental Psychology, this learning

by rote should not be taken to be much harmful or unscientific Though ' habit-memory ' is involved in this process rather than 'true memory', 'habit memory', according to psychologists, is not altogether imageless The forms in the रूपावलि are not non-sense syllables or imageless words There is, moreover, a sort of rhythm in the repetition of those forms and this rhythm indirectly helps pupils to memorize words If the forms in the रूपावलि have to be retained in memory throughout life for keeping some contact with Sanskrit literature, it is most essential for habit-formation or organization of proper disposition to get them learned by heart in childhood, which is the most favourable period for retention or 'prolonged memory'. It is already an established fact that some amount of intelligent memorizing is necessary for the ready grasp of any language If then we desire pupils to learn by heart those forms with comprehension, the remedy to be adopted for lessening the evil of unintelligent memorizing would be first of all to give at the initial stage some 'conversation lessons' in Sanskrit so as to make the pupils acquainted with the types of a Sanskrit sentence, and to let them understand through conversation the function of cases or inflexions in that sentence It must be remembered here that the unit of language is, according to the Modern Principles of Language-study, a sentence and not a word Of course, any new language should be introduced through sentences employed in coversation and not through disconnected words After such 'conversation lessons ' it would be advisable to make the pupils compare and contrast the Sanskrit inflexions with those in the mother tongue and then to supply

vernacular meanings of 'model words', the forms of which the pupils would learn. To facilitate this memory-work the 'principle of analogy' may be employed to lead the pupils to observe similarity in the various forms of Sanskrit words. Besides, from *the point of view of simplicity, frequency and utility,* words in the रूपावलि will have to be re-arranged.

Despite the tedium of rote-learning, a relieving feature in this method is the emphasis on 'oral work before written work or reading,' which *shows us how a principle of language-study has been unwittingly followed by the Shastris. The* learning of the forms of nouns and verbs gives pupils ample phonetic drill (आवर्तन, घ-पा) which *decidedly helps them to improve their Sanskrit* pronunciation. *Another good feature of this memory-*work is that the Shastris, instead of tiring their pupils' energy in the beginning with the drudgery of the formations of nouns and verbs as in the Grammar-translation *method, stress* the *mastery of* readymade forms of *frequent* nouns and verbs in the शब्दरूपावलि and धातुरूपावलि, and hence the study of literature, with the knowledge of this minimum of grammatical material *is started in the Shastri method* much earlier than it is done in the Grammar-translation method. Sanskrit literature shows its peculiar predilection for the Nominal rather than for the Verbal Style*. In other words, it abounds in the *forms of nouns and derivatives rather than in the*

* *"If the treatises of Panini and others had perished, and we had to construct a grammar of the Sanskrit from the classical literature (distinguished for its Nominal Style), our Verb and the Taddhita portion would be very meagre"*

—Dr R G Bhandarkar W. P Lectures

actual forms of finite verbs, and the methods of the Shastris are quite in consonance with this nature of Sanskrit Obviously, as more stress is laid, in the Shastri method, on the function of the case-forms of nouns than on the verbal forms, the energy of pupils, without being unnecessarily wasted in the derivation of verbal forms, is reserved and better utilized for the mastery of other important aspects of functional grammar, which directly help the understanding of literature, and which are quite sufficient even for the advanced study of the पञ्च महाकाव्यs

In this respect, the viewpoint of the Shastris is that the finite verb occupies a modest position in a Sanskrit sentence, since the major part of it generally consists of the subject and the object with their various adjuncts They, therefore, say that it is enough for average students, not wishing to be specialists in grammar, to know in a broad outline that such and such a verb is in such and such a tense mood, person and number The relation, say the Shastris, existing between a verb and a noun in a sentence being chiefly denoted by कारकविभक्तिs or case-forms, the knowledge of कारकs or case-relations is more important than that of the finite verb Thus the detailed knowledge of कारकs and a nodding acquaintance with verbal forms directly help pupils to understand the meaning of a sentence, and consequently, literature This practical outlook of the Shastris sufficiently accounts for their emphasis, at the initial stage, on the detailed knowledge of case-forms Again, since compounds are mainly based on case-relations, and since a sound knowledge of the function

of cases is presupposed for their dissolution, the study of the समासचक्र in the Shastri method after that of the शब्दरूपावलि is a natural gradation.

Moreover, as many of the provincial languages of India have been derived from or influenced by Sanskrit, they contain the same number of inflexions as the latter. Hence, the knowledge of inflexions and their function, which the pupils acquire while learning their mother tongue, serves them well for knowing the same in Sanskrit Again, the study of the mother tongue, particularly of its poetry, makes the pupils acquainted with a few *sandhis* and compounds Thus it will be seen that the knowledge of the mother tongue is of immense help to pupils for the study of Sanksrit, and that the Shastris intuitively follow the psychological principle of proceeding from the known to the unknown.

It would, therefore, be presumptuous to suppose that the Shastris knew nothing of the psychology of language-learning and the principles of language-study The views expressed by the वैयाकरणs, नैरुक्तs, नैयायिकs, मीमांसकs and आलङ्कारिकs about the denotative function or import of words (शब्दशक्ति) are *fraught* with pregnant suggestions which could be culled as principles of language-study When the Sanskrit language has perhaps been one of the most perfect and scientific expressions of the human mind, and when we actually find that Hindus have made substantial contributions to the different *branches* of the linguistic science, viz phonology, *grammar, etymology etc, there is nothing strange if the various schools of thought in ancient* India *should anticipate some principles of philology* and language-study *as propounded by* Western Scholars

The various modes of learning the denotative function or import of words as recognized by all schools of thought in India are*.—

(1) Grammar, (2) Comparison, (3) Dictionary, (4) Statement of a trustworthy person, (5) Usage of elders, (6) Context or supplementary statement, (7) Explanation by synonyms or paraphrase and (8) Contiguity with a well-known word.

Vishwanatha Nyaya-Panchanana hints that ideas can be conveyed even through gestures, facial expressions, etc.†

Out of these eight modes, the fourth and the fifth are the most important, as they are representative of the Direct Method of the West, and allow full play to the 'spontaneous capacities' of a child to learn a language, while the rest compel him to use his 'studial capacities' which are generally developed in adult age. According to the fifth mode, a child learns the import of words principally from the observation of the activities and usage of elders, and forms the habit of establishing a 'direct bond' between words and ideas by the psychological process of 'unconscious assimilation' and 'imitation.'

Particularly the अन्विताभिधानवादीs of the मीमांसा school recognize the 'usage of elders' as the chief mode of language-learning, and hold that 'a sentence is the unit of language and not a word', while the अभिहितान्वयवादीs of the same school say that the

---

* शक्तिग्रहं व्याकरणोपमानकोशाप्तवाक्याद् व्यवहारतश्च ।
वाक्यस्य शेषाद्विवृतेर्वदन्ति सान्निध्यतः सिद्धपदस्य वृद्धाः ॥

† न तु ज्ञायमानं पदं करणं, पदाभावेऽपि मौनिश्लोकादौ शाब्दबोधात् ।
— सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलिः

senses of individual words (पदs) are combined to form the larger sense of a sentence as a whole, and recognize आकाङ्क्षा (expectancy), योग्यता (consistency), *सन्निधि (contiguity) and तात्पर्य* (purport) *of words* as the means of understanding a sentence The वैयाकरणs who propound the theory of स्फोट by holding a non-eternal word to be the manifested form of the unmanifested or eternal word (स्फोट), acknowledge वाक्यस्फोट *or the indivisible sense of a sentence as the chief one, yet for facilitating the understanding of pupils they sanction the existence of individual words and resort to the analytical process of separating words* into their प्रकृतिs (original forms) and प्रत्ययs (suffixes) *The* आलङ्कारिकs *amalgamate in general all these* views about language and acknowledge व्यङ्ग्यार्थ (suggested sense) along with वाच्यार्थ (expressed sense) and लक्ष्यार्थ (secondary sense) These are, in *short, the views of the Indian schools of thought about the relation between a word and its meaning and the modes of learning both of them*

As indicated above, the regular and intelligent study of literature according to the Shastri method is started after the thorough learning of the minimum of functional grammar and the lexicon for about six months Generally this study *begins* with the *reading of the* हितोपदेश or पञ्चतन्त्र and the second canto of the रघुवंश The Shastris are here in complete agreement with the modern methodists in starting with connected passages from literature and not with disconnected sentences which in the Grammar-translation method are *introduced simply to illustrate the rules of grammar* But some Shastris,

instead of beginning with stories in prose from the पञ्चतन्त्र or हितोपदेश and with simple and interesting सुभाषितs, teach first of all रघुवंश, which is for pupils in the elementary stage a hard nut to crack. In the interest of beginners the introduction of simple prose rather than of poetry, then of concrete and interesting सुभाषितs, and then of poetic passages from the रामायण and the महाभारत rather than of cantos from the पञ्चमहाकाव्यs, would be a better gradation in the teaching of literature The high-flown style of the later महाकाव्यs and Sanskrit prose being beyond the comprehension of young pupils, original passages from the classical literature will have to be adapted or simplified to suit the capacities of beginners Shastris with a progressive bent of mind agree to this principle of gradation, and preferring, at the outset, the teaching of the हितोपदेश or पञ्चतन्त्र to that of the पञ्चमहाकाव्यs have improved upon the old order Further, to develop enough language sense and improve pronunciation they ask their pupils to learn by heart, along with the रूपावलि etc, a large number of सुभाषितs, the meaning of which can be easily understood by the pupils without any explanation, owing to the occurrence in them of many तत्सम (Sanskrit) words current in the mother tongue

In accordance with a well-known Sanskrit saying, § even a dull person does not begin any work, unless he knows its purpose or motive Naturally, when the study of any literary work or Shastra was commenced, four requisites or अनुबन्धs † were dis-

§ प्रयोजनमनुद्दिश्य न मन्दोऽपि प्रवर्तते ।

† अनुबन्धचतुष्टय नामाधिकारिविषयसम्बन्धप्रयोजनानि ।—वेदान्तसारः

cussed (i) the competency of the student to understand a work, (ii) the subject-matter, (iii) connection between the subject-matter and the work to be studied and (iv) *the motive or inducement to enter* upon the study It is worth while noting that out of these four requisites the student and his capacity being the most important are given the first place in the अनुबन्धs Also at the beginning of many books appear the significant words 'बालानां सुखबोधाय', 'बालमित्रप्रबोधाय' (*for the easy grasp of beginners*), *which indicate that the capacity of a student was a* matter of the foremost consideration Again, the four अनुबन्धs giving the pupil a broad and synthetic view of the subject to be studied, become incentives to his further study

Here one cannot resist the temptation of comparing the five Herbartian steps of teaching (viz I Preparation, II Presentation, III Association, IV Generalization and V Application) with the five formal steps followed by the Hindus in the learning of various subjects Of course, the formal steps of the Hindus do not quite correspond to the Herbartian steps except in the case of their number The number and sequence of the steps followed by the Hindus varied with the nature of the subject-matter to be taught, and hence they were more flexible than rigid In actual practice, even the number and sequence of the Herbartian steps are never rigidly followed for fear that the procedure of teaching would be made mechanical at the sacrifice of spontaneous charm in it It was then wise on the part of the Hindus that they did not adopt the same number of steps for the teaching of different subjects The steps for teaching different

Shastras were more logical than psychological and more analytic than synthetic, as they suited the students who had reached the conceptual level; whereas in the elementary stage, the steps for teaching 'literature', though not strictly psychological or synthetic, suited, on the whole, the pupils of the perceptual level.

Now the steps for the teaching of any Shastra, particularly Logic, were-(i) Assertion or proposition, (ii) Reason, (iii) Example, (iv) Application of the example and (v) Conclusion.*

Those for the teaching of Meemansa and Vedanta were—(i) Statement of the *topic*, (ii) *Doubt*, (iii) Objection, (iv) Answer or the established view, and (v) Consistency of the topic with the preceding and following ones. §

In regard to the fifth step the student had to ascertain the consistency of a topic with a section, of a section with a chapter, and of a chapter with the whole work or Shastra.† Thus the last step helped the student to look at a subject mainly *from the synthetic point of view*.

To make sure of the purport (तात्पर्य) of a book or a subject in a synthetic manner the Meemansakas have pronounced six steps, and asked us to look at a work or a subject from the following points of

---

* प्रतिज्ञाहेतूदाहरणोपनयनिगमनानि पञ्चावयवाः — तर्कसंग्रहः।

§ विषयो विशयश्चैव पूर्वपक्षस्तथोत्तरम्।
सङ्गतिश्चेति पञ्चाङ्गं शास्त्रेऽधिकरणं विदुः॥

† शास्त्रेऽध्याये तथा पादे न्यायसङ्गतयस्त्रिधा।
शास्त्रादिविषये ज्ञाते तत्तत्सङ्गतिरुह्यताम्॥
—वैयासिकन्यायमाला.

view—(I) Unity of the beginning and conclusion of a work, (II) Repetition of the main topic in various contexts, (III) Novelty of the subject-matter, (IV) *Fruit or result* (V) *Praise or incidental remarks as distinguished from the main theme and* (VI) Arguments in favour of the main topic †

It must be noted here that the five steps of Logic, as indicated above, being based on the general process and sequence of human thought are employed in the study of many Shastras Those logical steps along with the Law of Causal Relation (कार्यकारणसम्बन्ध) and the Seven Categories (सप्तपदार्थ) with their sub-divisions have contributed much to the methodical treatment of many Shastras, and *are a distinct achievement from the point of view of methodology* Thus *Logic and Grammar* hold a prominent place among the Hindu Shastras as sciences of wider application, the study of logic being quite indispensable to the study of any other Shastra Instead of those five steps some thinkers recognize three steps only by dispensing with प्रतिज्ञा and उपनय, since प्रतिज्ञा (assertion) is the same as निगमन (conclusion), and since उपनय by mere repetition unifies हेतु, पक्ष and साध्य in the form of a statement But inference (अनुमान) is divided into 'inference for one's self' (स्वार्थानुमान) and 'inference for others' (परार्थानुमान). The first consists of three steps, while the second being composed of five steps is utilized for demonstrating a topic to others This demonstration is readily converted into five steps

† उपक्रमोपसंहारावभ्यासोऽपूर्वता फलम् ।
अर्थवादोपपत्ती च लिङ्गं तात्पर्यनिर्णये ॥

of logical teaching and is correlated with the above special steps of other Shastras The modern methodology too enunciates five Herbartian steps which are grounded on Logic as well as Psychology. The modern technique of teaching is, therefore, not only logical but psychological also. Again, the Hindu syllogism of five steps is not merely a 'deductive' but a 'deductive-inductive' process, for, the third step or 'general proposition with an example' (उदाहरण) is a brief record of the actual 'observation' of facts The सूत्रs or generalisations which the वैयाकरणs arrived at by employing the Logical Methods of Agreement and Difference (अन्वय & व्यतिरेक) are also the records of the linguistic phenomena actually observed. It may thus be stated that the वैयाकरणs used the logical methods of 'Induction' and 'Deduction' in expounding grammar.

In spite of the five steps followed in the teaching of Shastras, the logical procedure that was generally resorted to in the actual expounding of a Shastra consisted of three steps, viz उद्देश, लक्षण and परीक्षा. (I) उद्देश means the 'enumeration' of the topics to be dealt with in their succession. (II) लक्षण is the 'definition' of a thing and it ought to be free from the faults of अव्याप्ति (non-pervasion), अतिव्याप्ति (over-extension) and असम्भव (total absence) of the attributes of that thing (III) Lastly, परीक्षा or 'examination' is the settlement of the true nature of a thing by the application of four means of valid knowledge, viz प्रत्यक्ष (perception), अनुमान (inference), उपमान (comparison) and शब्द (verbal testimony)

From this we need not suppose that Hindus concentrated their attention on Logic alone to the detriment of Psychology. Leaving aside the distant past we can find from the Upanishadic times scattered references to psychological problems in the vast range of Sanskrit literature. The Upanishads describe 'Mind' as an organism unifying in itself its own functions as काम (desire), सङ्कल्प (will), विचिकित्सा (doubt or discrimination), श्रद्धा (faith), अश्रद्धा (absence of faith), धृति (confidence, contentment, constancy), अधृति (want of confidence, etc), ह्री (shame or bashfulness), धी (understanding or reason) and भी (fear)$. These functions, being the manifestations of the same organic unity (mind), can well compare with the instincts propounded by modern psychologists It must be noted that these various phases of the mind are not described here as distinct Faculties coming severally into operation, but are the functions of the same 'living organism', (अन्त.करण) as waves on the surface of the sea From this we clearly comprehend that the Upanishadic sages do not lose sight of the inherent unity the mind,* as the Faculty Psychologists lose In spite of the foregoing varied functions of the mind, later Sanskrit works like the साङ्ख्यकारिका, the पातञ्जलयोगसूत्र, the योगवासिष्ठ, the भगवद्गीता and others recognised, as the shortest cut to Self-Realization, four functions of the mind, viz. मनस्, बुद्धि, चित्त and अहंकार. As these

$ काम सङ्कल्पो विचिकित्सा श्रद्धाऽश्रद्धा धृतिरधृतिर्ह्रीर्धीर्भी रित्येतत्सर्वं मन एव। (बृ उ १।५।३)

* इत्येतत्सर्वं मन एव। Note that 'मनस्' is in the singular number in spite of its manifold functions.

four functions are called अन्तःकरणचतुष्टय or the internal organs of the आत्मन् to hold communion with the environment through the senses, connection can be established between external Nature and the Self by means of these internal organs (करण), which lead an aspirant gradually to the highest regions of the आत्मन्—the ultimate goal of all beings—on the ascending scales of मनस्, बुद्धि, चित्त and अहंकार. In ancient times the highest aim of education was the Realization of the Self in the innumerable things of the Universe. In other words, this is not the weal or emancipation of the Individual Soul but also of the Community, and the functions of the mind, as mentioned above, were enumerated to be four only with this particular end in view. These functions come into operation on the conscious level, yet they do not sever connection with the unconscious level of the mind, which is the main spring of all conscious behaviour. Although they do not quite correspond to the threefold activity (Feeling, Thinking and Willing) of consciousness as propounded by modern psychology, yet मनस् can be compared slightly with Affection or Feeling and Conation or, Willing, since मनस् functions through सङ्कल्प and विकल्प [सङ्कल्पविकल्पात्मकं मनः] or the transient (passing) phases of Will and Emotion. The phases of Affection and Conation can be found in विकल्प and सङ्कल्प respectively, yet both of them do not exhibit so much stability as to reach the state of determination for action. The power of thinking or reasoning is, on the other hand, connected with बुद्धि, which predominates in the niceties of Logic. चित्त or Memory is connect-

From this we need not suppose that Hindus concentrated their attention on Logic alone to the detriment of Psychology. Leaving aside the distant past we can find from the Upanishadic times scattered references to psychological problems in the vast range of Sanskrit literature The Upanishads describe ' Mind ' as an organism unifying in itself its own functions as काम (desire), सङ्कल्प (will) विचिकित्सा (doubt or discrimination), श्रद्धा (faith), अश्रद्धा (absence of faith), धृति (confidence, contentment, constancy), अधृति (want of confidence, etc), ह्री (shame or bashfulness), धी (understanding or reason) and भी (fear)$ These functions, being the manifestations of the same *organic* unity (mind), *can well compare with the instincts propounded by modern psychologists It must be noted that* these various phases of the mind are not *described* here as distinct Faculties coming severally into operation, but are the functions of the same ' living organism ', (अन्तःकरण) as waves on the surface of the sea. From this we clearly comprehend that the Upanishadic sages do not lose sight of the inherent unity the mind,* as the Faculty Psychologists lose In spite of the foregoing varied functions of the mind, later Sanskrit works like the साङ्ख्यकारिका, the पातञ्जलयोगसूत्रs, the योगवासिष्ठ, *the भगवद्गीता and others recognised as* the shortest cut to Self-Realization, four functions of the mind, viz मनस्, बुद्धि, चित्त and अहङ्कार. As these

$ काम सङ्कल्पो विचिकित्सा श्रद्धाऽश्रद्धा धृतिरधृतिर्ह्रीर्धीर्भी-
रित्येतत्सर्वं मन एव । (बृ उ १।५।३)

* इत्येतत्सर्वं मन एव । Note that ' मनस् ' is in the singular number in spite of its manifold functions

four functions are called अन्तःकरणचतुष्टय or the internal organs of the आत्मन् to hold communion with the environment through the senses, connection can be established between external Nature and the Self by means of these internal organs (करण), which lead an aspirant gradually to the highest regions of the आत्मन्—the ultimate goal of all beings—on the ascending scales of मनस्, बुद्धि, चित्त and अहंकार. In ancient times the highest aim of education was the Realization of the Self in the innumerable things of the Universe In other words, this is not the weal or emancipation of the Individual Soul but also of the Community, and the functions of the mind, as mentioned above, were enumerated to be four only with this particular end in view. These functions come into operation on the conscious level, yet they do not sever connection with the unconscious level of the mind, which is the main spring of all conscious behaviour. Although they do not quite correspond to the threefold activity (Feeling, Thinking and Willing) of consciousness as propounded by modern psychology, yet मनस् can be compared slightly with Affection or Feeling and Conation or Willing, since मनस् functions through सङ्कल्प and विकल्प [सङ्कल्पविकल्पात्मक मनः] or the transient (passing) phases of Will and Emotion The phases of Affection and Conation can be found in विकल्प and सङ्कल्प respectively, yet both of them do not exhibit so much stability as to reach the state of determination for action The power of thinking or reasoning is, on the other hand, connected with बुद्धि, which predominates in the niceties of Logic चित्त or Memory is connect-

ed with the experiences of the past and works in alliance with the Imagination (कल्पना or प्रतिभा) of poets This will clearly show that Hindus have formed definite views on the psychology of Self-Realization or in modern terminology, on the Sublimation of instincts and have made use of this psychology in their educational efforts *Among the four functions of the mind each latter is more internal than the former, and hence these functions serve as graded steps to Self-Realization*

We cannot say that the threefold Western distinction of Consciousness into Feeling, Thinking, and Willing is superior to the foregoing fourfold distinction of the Hindus *The inadequacy of this threefold distinction has been sufficiently proved by* Psycho-Analysis, which ventures to probe into the unconscious level of the mind Although this unconscious level cannot be precisely described as सुषुप्ति or deep sleep it being intimately connected also with the unconsciousness in the wakeful state, yet deep sleep mostly consists of this unconscious level The योगवासिष्ठ & श्रीशङ्कराचार्य (in his commentary on the माण्डूक्यकारिका) analyse the wakeful state into जाग्रज्जाग्रत् (*wakefulness-consciousness in the wakeful state*), जाग्रत्स्वप्न (reverie or day-dream), and जाग्रत्सुषुप्ति (sleep or unconsciousness in the wakeful state) *Thus the state of forgetfulness or sub-consciousness in the wakeful state is* जाग्रत्सुषुप्ति (*deep sleep in the wakeful state*) *Hence we can approximately compare the unconscious level of the Psycho Analysts with deep sleep* (सुषुप्ति) *either in wakefulness or in deep sleep itself, or with both of them* The attempts of the Psycho-Analysts, therefore, have

decidedly not proceeded beyond groping in the dark of 'deep sleep' (सुषुप्ति), which the Hindus have long ago transcended by pointing to the Self-luminous and Eternal Seer (साक्षी, द्रष्टा, परमात्मा, सदाशिव) of all the three states of the mind. This Seer is the unifying principle not only of an individual but also of all beings and the Universe. He is the unifier of individuality (व्यष्टि) and totality (समष्टि). This again shows that the Hindus have devoted their attention to the Pyschology of the Individual as well as of the Group.

The Will or सङ्कल्प that is associated with मनस् is indeterminate; yet the Will that is allied with बुद्धि (Reason) is of the nature of determinate action (व्यवसायात्मिका). The latter form of Will transforms itself into human activities, religious and secular. The activities that are performed with various worldly ends in view are secular; while those that lead one to the Eternal Bliss are religious. According to this two-fold manifestation of Will sciences dealing with several branches of knowledge are also classified into worldly sciences and the Transcendental Science. Worldly sciences (अपरा विद्या) lead human beings to worldly prosperity (अभ्युदय); while the Transcendental Science (परा विद्या) deals with the inner progress of a human being towards his original destination, and leads him to the Eternal Bliss (निःश्रेयस) or the Realization of the Self. It need not be supposed from this classification that the Hindu thinkers concentrated their attention on

नि श्रेयस alone by ignoring worldly prosperity and worldly sciences The progress of worldly sciences in India can be seen in the development of sixty-four Arts (कला) and fourteen branches of Human Knowledge (विद्या) This lore has found expression *in some written works on the respective subjects and has been handed down by oral tradition from generation to generation in several families and* classes noted for speciality in it The paucity of written works on it, modern machinery, industriali zation and general apathy have, however, given a serious set-back to all of it, and the worldly sciences in India in their struggle for existence are *on the point of being extinct*

The Individual Will, that transforms itself into manifold human activities and branches of human knowledge is a fraction of the Universal Will or Energy which emanates through हिरण्यगर्भ (the illumi *nant of the Cosmic Dream*) who is *a manifestation of the Eternal Seer* The Universal Will *or energy of* हिरण्यगर्भ *is the same as the Will of an Individual*, and manifests itself in the same way in which it does in an individual Just as human actions before they come into operation, are of the nature of Will (सङ्कल्प), so this ' Creation ', before it comes into being is of the nature of the Universal Will This phenomenon of the transformation of the individual or cosmic dream into the individual or cosmic wakefulness is constantly going on through the energy (शक्ति) of the Eternal Seer (साक्षी, द्रष्टा, चित), who illumines every individual or cosmic activity

and inactivity, and unifies all the three states of beings, viz. Wakefulness, Dream and Sleep, or the present, the future and the past. This is, in short, unity in diversity. The same Cosmic Will that creates this universe unfolds itself through innumerable forms of the Individual Will. It prompts a person with a particular motive or will to achieve success or attain proficiency in a particular thing, and enables that person to concentrate all activities, educational or non-educational, on that motive or will. When the original unity of the Individual Will with the Cosmic Will is re-established, success in matters, religious and secular, or educational and non-educational, is not far off, since it immediately leads one either to worldly prosperity (अभ्युदय) or to the eternal emancipation (निःश्रेयस). All forms of human activity are thus rooted in this Will (सङ्कल्प) and its stability. A special science, named मन्त्रशास्त्र, which has been based on the potency of this Will (सङ्कल्प) and on its transformation into actions, has been developed in India and is worthy of being studied as the Psychology of Action or the science of training the Will.

Out of the four functions of the internal organ (अन्तःकरण) the ego or अहङ्कार makes every being conscious of himself and leads him to establish his own individuality in the scheme of the universe. This may be called the instinct of self-assertion or the self-instinct. This ego or consciousness of 'individuality' is not different from the Eternal Seer, as a drop from water. In reality, it is merely an attribute

superimposed (अध्यस्त) upon the Eternal Seer (द्रष्टा), who illuminates conscious as well as unconscious phases of the mind. It again interlinks the Subject (विषयी) with the Object (विषय) or the internal nature (अन्तःप्रकृति) with the external one (बाह्यप्रकृति). When this self-consciousness (अहङ्कार) merges in the eternal आत्मन् or the Highest Self, the state of emancipation or Realization of the Self is manifested. The Eternal Self or Seer illumines innumerable individual souls or minds, and the aggregate (समष्टि) of all such minds being illumined by the same Eternal Seer can be termed 'Group Mind' according to modern psychology. This group mind can be conceived only when similarity or unity of individual souls or minds is postulated.

Western Psychology has not as yet achieved success in proving the existence of this unity, or in accounting for it. It is up to now engaged in describing in detail the various *manifestations* of the moods of mind rather than in pointing to the substratum (अधिष्ठान) of all of them. It delights in counting the waves on the surface of the sea rather than in fathoming water. It seeks to *describe* mind rather than *define it*. This trend of Western Psychology turns a thinker away from the substratum and leads him to commit the blunder, as the Ultra-Behaviourists do, of conceiving mind as not apart *from* physical behaviour. Psychology cannot hope to reach the stage of perfection, if it departs from the substratum of mental activities and concentrates only on the external manifestations of

the mind. The Eternal Seer (साक्षी, द्रष्टा) is the substratum of all conscious and unconscious phases of the mind and in him the line of demarcation between the 'Conscious' and the 'Unconscious' vanishes, no scope being afforded for words to describe the 'Seer' or the 'Absolute'. When the 'object', which is not originally apart from the subject, is dissolved in the latter, the original state of the Eternal Seer or the Absolute is manifested, leaving no room for any kind of verbal description or definition. It is this Eternal Seer who illuminates the individual minds as well as the group mind, and removing all differences of individual souls or minds establishes the unity or uniformity of the group mind. Thus the oriental thinkers have gone ahead of the Westerners in respect of psychological researches. It is then beyond doubt that the Hindus, without leaving out of account the substratum of mind, have substantially contributed to the educational principles based on the psychology of the individual as well as of the group.

An attempt has been made above to show in a broad outline the main features of Hindu psychology. It must be noted here that sciences that lead us to knowledge can be correlated with one another from a comprehensive point of view, though the detailed- treatment of a particular branch of knowledge obliges us to dissociate one science from another. The truth of this statement is realized especially in the case of psychology and philosophy, which, though they are distinguished from

each other for the sake of convenient exposition, are wrongly supposed to be innately distinct from each other. Psychology and Philosophy are, *however, so inseparably connected that one* would remain imperfect without the aid of the other Philosophy, which is the science of sciences, relieves itself from pure abstractions by resorting to psychology and describing the phenomena of the mind, which is in some way connected with the inner soul, while the real aim of psychology is, and ought to be, to culminate in phi*losophy. Hoffding says, "In many ways philoso*phical research has played into the hands of psychological research, consciously or unconsciously philosophical speculation always works with psy*chological elements, and in philosophical specula*tions are deposited many profound psychological observations and ideas". This is the reason why the Philosophy of the Hindus contains numerous *psychological observations*, which if culled and organized, give us a consistent idea of the nature of Hindu psychology, Thus the psychology and philosophy of the Upanishads were amalgamated *in ancient times with the psychology of the* साङ्ख्य and योग systems Nay, the psychology of the साङ्ख्य and योग systems, particularly of the योग system, seems to be generally accepted even by the heterodox systems of the बौद्ध, जैन, etc , though *there might be differences among them as regards* the details and the ultimate reality It is hoped that the Hindu psychology would supply a sound basis

for the Psychology of the Unconscious, which has recently attracted the attention of thinkers in the West

This psychology and the principles of education propounded by the Hindus have resulted, not in the repression of instincts, but in the *Sublimation* of the individual and the group mind The culmination of their individual and social activities, in their sublimated form, is found not only in the worldly prosperity, but in the Realization of the Self The proper direction of all those worldly and religious activities can be traced in the nation-building attempts of Shree Krishna, Lord Buddha Ashoka, Chandragupta, Chanakya, Shree Shankaracharya, Vidyaranya, Shivaji and various other Indian heroes and saints, who, for the propagation of their particular motives and teachings, realized the inner truth of 'group psychology' as a powerful instrument for the uplift of the nation *The idea therefore, of the 'group mind' is not* foreign to the Hindus, and the science that shows the ways of properly directing the group mind to a worthy goal is not unknown to them

The 'group mind' and the psychical laws underlying it have also been dealt with in the Science of Dramaturgy, which was long ago carried to perfection by venerable Bharata Muni In a drama represented on the stage, the laws governing the working of the group mind are presupposed for its *successful conclusion and bewitching effect as a* whole. The audience assembled for witnessing a

dramatic performance represents 'a psychological group', and a dramatist has to satisfy the curiosity of spectators, all and sundry, by writing and repre senting a drama in an effective manner The नाट्यशास्त्र of भरत lays down rules that ought to be followed by dramatists and actors for making their plays full of abiding interest

Again, भरत deals with the *emotional aspect of psychology* by *constructing the theory of* रस (the highest joy or aesthetic delight) He has broadly enumerated *forty-nine* emotions (भाव), out of which he takes *eight* as स्थायिभावs (sentiments or permanent emotions), *eight* as सात्त्विकभावs (involuntary express ions of intense emotions) and *thirty-three* as व्यभिचारिभावs (transient or subordinate emotins) If the सात्त्विकभावs are taken to be the bodily effects of emotions from the physical point of view and classified with अनुभावs (consequents or ensuants) the number of भावs (*emotions*) *would be forty-one* The स्थायिभावs exist in the minds of all living beings in the form of latent impressions (सत्कारs) or permanent instincts (वासना) from their birth According to भरत they* are—(1) रति (Love), (2) हास (Mirth) (3) शोक (Sorrow), (4) क्रोध (*Anger*), (5) उत्साह (Energy), (6) भय (Fear), (7) जुगुप्सा (Disgust), and (8) विस्मय (Astonishment) These स्थायिभावs, *according to* भरत, *are developed into eight aesthetic sentiments* (रस)†, which respectively are—

* भरत—नाट्यशास्त्र, अ ६।१७ † भ ना, अ ६।१५

(1) शृङ्गार (the Erotic), (2) हास्य (the Comic), (3) करुण (the Pathetic), (4) रौद्र (the Furious), (5) वीर (the Heroic), (6) भयानक (the Terrible), (7) बीभत्स (the Odious), and (8) अद्भुत (the Marvellous)*. Later authors have added शान्त (the Quietistic) as the ninth रस with 'शम' (Tranquillity) as its स्थायिभाव.

About seven of the above स्थायिभावs can be compared with the corresponding emotions in the list of fourteen primary emotions with their instincts enumerated by McDougall. The seven corresponding emotions of McDougall with their instincts are—(1) Lust-Mating, (2) Amusement-Laughter, (3) Distress-Appeal, (4) Anger-Combat, (5) Fear-Escape, (6) Disgust-Repulsion, and (7) Wonder-Curiosity. No parallel to the स्थायिभाव of उत्साह (Energy) and its रस 'वीर' (the Heroic) can be found in the list of McDougall. 'वीररस', however, may properly be connected with the emotion of *anger*, which can be its स्थायिभाव with its corresponding instinct of *combat*. Again, anger must be accompanied by 'उत्साह' (Energy) for the enhancement of वीररस. If वात्सल्य is recognized as a रस, it can be brought into line with the 'tender emotion' of McDougall with its corresponding 'parental instinct'.

The *eight* सात्विक भावs$ (involuntary expressions of mental states) are : (1) स्तम्भ (Paralysis), (2) स्वेद

* Some English equivalents to भावs etc. have been taken from the 'History of Sanskrit Poetics', Vol. II, by Dr. S. K. De.

$ भरत–नाट्यशास्त्र, अ. ६।२२.

(Sweating, Perspiration), (3) रोमाञ्च (Horripilation), (4) स्वरभङ्ग (Change of Voice), (5) वेपथु (Trembling), (6) वैवर्ण्य (Change of Colour), (7) अश्रु (Weeping, tears), and (8) प्रलय (Fainting). All these are the physical expressions of some intense emotion; yet they *are not the definite indications* of a particular emotion. For instance, horripilation (रोमाञ्च) is the indication of fear as well as joy, and tears (अश्रु) are the expression of sorrow as well as joy. Although these physical expressions refer to a *mental* state, yet भरत must have found it difficult *to assign them to particular emotions.* He, therefore, *thought it expedient to signify the intense* emotions through the general physical indications, and characterize them as 'सात्त्विकभावs.' Even the modern psychology admits that though an emotion predominantly consists of the affective element, it is allied, in a lesser degree, with the conative element and some bodily expressions.* This nature of emotions, perhaps, induced भरत to *give an indirect description of intense emotional* states (सात्त्विक भावs) through their involuntary expressions on the body. The suggestion of a definite emotion like 'Sorrow' or 'Fear' through those general bodily expressions will, of course, depend upon the particular context or situation in which they are exhibited. Properly speaking, the सात्त्विक भावs are the *effects* of intense emotions and

* McDougall : An Outline of Psychology, P. 317.

should be placed in the category of अनुभावs, as will be seen later on.

All the thirty—three व्यभिचारिभावs, $ otherwise called सञ्चारिभावs (Transient-subordinate emotions or Accessories), need not be mentioned here. A few of them are: निर्वेद (Self-disparagemant), शङ्का (Apprehension), असूया (Envy), चिन्ता (Anxiety, reflection), स्मृति (Recollection), धृति (Equanimity), व्रीडा (Shame, bashfulness), हर्ष (Joy), आवेग (Agitation, flurry), गर्व (Arrogance), विषाद (Despair), औत्सुक्य (Impatience) etc. These are directly indicative of the mental states; but some व्यभिचारिभावs like ग्लानि (weakness), श्रम (weariness), आलस्य (Indolence), जडता (Stupor) etc. are indirectly indicative of the mental states through the bodily expressions, and the same explanation as given above may be applied here also. A general remark may be made here that when भरत looks at mental states (सात्त्विक भावs or व्यभिचारिभावs) from the subjective point of view, he refers to them directly; and when he looks objectively at those states, he refers to them through physical expressions. For, the physical states mentioned by him are connected with their corresponding mental states. Every living being who shows a particular physical state can be thought to have some corresponding mental state. Again, there are some mental states which cannot be indicated except through physical expressions, and they are निद्रा

$ भरत–नाट्यशास्त्र, अ. ६।१८–२१.

(sleep or drowsiness), अपस्मार (Epilepsy), सुप्त (Dreaming), व्याधि (Sickness), उन्माद (Insanity), मरण (The state before death) etc There is, however, some room for revision and re-organization in the list of the thirty-three व्यभिचारिभावs in the light of modern psychology *For instance, it is possible to* find similarity between 'निर्वेद' (Self-disparagement) and McDougall's primary emotion of 'Negative Self-feeling' with its instinct of submission, and between गर्व (Arrogance) and the primary emotion of 'Positive self-feeling' with its instinct of self-assertion

This treatment of emotions in the नाट्यशास्त्र is more or less psychological or rather psycho-physical भरत does not deal so much with the cognitive and *conative aspects of the mind as he does* with its affective (emotional) aspect, for, he wants to expound the *theory* of रस (Aesthetic delight), which is manifested in the drama In spite of a *few* flaws in his classification of emotions, भरत, the ancient sage, *certainly deserves the credit of* making a psychological approach to the drama and inspiring later authors to apply the dramatic theory of रस to poetry and literature in general The theory of रस is centred in भरत's famous aphorism 'विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद्रसनिष्पत्तिः' $ which broadly means that the latent स्थायिभावs manifest themselves into रसs

$ भरत–नाट्यशास्त्र, अ. ६.

when they are united with the विभावs, अनुभावs, and व्यभिचारिभावs. In the phenomenal world when we come into contact with a particular situation, we naturally react to it. In other words, the situation serves as a *stimulus* which causes in us an emotional *response*, pleasant or unpleasant. Thus the stimulus is the cause, of which the response is the effect. This psychological fact has some resemblance to the theory of रस, though the stimulus-response formula does not exactly correspond to the विभावs etc. and रस. For, the stimulus and the response are respectively the real cause and the real effect in the phenomenal world, and the emotional effect or response produced by the stimulus is pleasure as well as pain; while the विभावs (*Excitants*) and अनुभावs (*Ensuants*) *which* are respectively the imaginary causes and effects in the world of drama and poetry invariably manifest a pleasurable response in the form of रस (Aesthetic delight). The विभावs (Excitants) are further sub-*divided* into आलम्बनविभाव (*The essential excitant*) and the उद्दीपनविभाव (The enhancing excitant). The former is the hero or heroine exciting emotions in drama or poetry, and the latter is the external situation or surroundings imagined in drama or poetry for favouring the excitement of emotions. Now अनुभावs (Ensuants) are the effects or physical expressions of the emotions of the hero or other characters in drama or poetry. They are almost the same as the सात्त्विकभावs; yet if a distinction between

the सात्त्विकभाव*s* and अनुभाव*s* is to be made, it may be said that the former are involuntary expressions, while the latter are voluntary expressions. When the स्थायिभाव of the hero or other characters is represented in drama or poetry through the *skilful depiction of the* विभाव*s*, अनुभाव*s* and व्यभिचारिभाव*s* of the characters themselves, the same स्थायिभाव, which exists latently in the minds of spectators or readers, also, is awakened and developed into रस. Now in relation to the hero or other characters the विभाव*s* in drama or poetry are the causes and the अनुभाव*s* are the *effects*. Yet in relation to *the spectators or readers the dramatic or poetic* presentation of the विभाव*s*, अनुभाव*s* and व्यभिचारिभाव*s* collectively becomes the cause of awakening रस in them. A thing to be noted in the case of the अनुभाव*s* is that they become the causes with reference to the spectators or readers, even though with reference to the characters they are the effects. † When the spectators or readers identify themselves with the dramatic or poetic situation, the विभाव*s* etc. being idealized in their minds are united with their स्थायिभाव and reveal in them extreme literary delight or रस. This delight makes itself visible on their

† स्थायिभावाननुभावयन्तः सामाजिकान् भ्रूविक्षेपकटाक्षादयो रसपोषकारिणोऽनुभावाः। एते चाभिनयकाव्ययोरप्यनुभावयतो साक्षाद्भावकाननुभवकर्मतयानुभूयन्त इत्यनुभवनमिति चानुभावा रसिकेषु व्यपदिश्यन्ते। विकारो (कार्यम्) भावसंसूचनात्मक इति तु लौकिकरसापेक्षया, इह (अलौकिकरसे) तु तेषां कारणत्वमेव।—दशरूपकम्, ४।३.

bodies in the form of their अनुभावs or सात्त्विकभावs which, though they are causes at the former stage, again appear as effects. Thus the theory of nine रसs with their स्थायिभावs, व्यभिचारिभावs, विभावs and अनुभावs treats mainly of the Affective or emotional aspect of the mind.

This रस, according to the peculiarity of the विभावs, etc., assumes particular phases of शृङ्गार, वीर, करुण, etc., and is experienced by all human beings. In other words, the union of the peculiar moods of actors and the audience, or of the Subject (विषयी) and the Object (विषय) in the dramatic or poetic representation, manifests a particular phase of रस. But as this रस, emancipated from its particular phases, is of the nature of supreme bliss (परनिर्वृति, आनन्द) underlying the nine रसs, it is unity in diversity. Hence, the ancient writers on dramaturgy like अभिनवगुप्त and later literary critics like जगन्नाथ correlated the Sanskrit Poetics with the philosophy of the Upanishads, and declared the highest delight derived from literature to be akin to the experience of the highest ब्रह्मन् (ब्रह्मास्वादसहोदर). Nay, they suggest that all literary delight for its consummation must get itself freed from all consiouness of particularity (विगलितवेद्यान्तर) and transformed into the highest bliss of परमात्मन् or the Eternal Seer, as is indicated by the Upanishadic saying, " The highest

---

रसगङ्गाधर, P. 27.

bliss is रस itself. After attaining the very रस, he becomes full of delight."*

For the interesting representation of this रस with its eight or nine phases before the audience or the group mind, भरत has formulated some rules, which, in combination with the five elements of the dramatic plot (अर्थप्रकृति) and five psychological stages (क्रमावस्था), develop into five junctures (सन्धि) of the drama. Every dramatic performance has to undergo these five junctures so as to come to a successful conclusion and maintain the unity and interest of the plot The division of the plot into acts and scenes has been broadly conceived by भरत with this end in view. In actualities, however, the five junctures of the drama do not always correspond to its acts and scenes.

In the composition and representation of a drama the वस्तु or the plot is divided into the *principal* † or *main* action (आधिकारिक) and the *incidental* or *subsidiary* action (प्रासङ्गिक) Connection between the main plot and the subordinate elements, helping its successful achievement, is established by the correspondence or union of अर्थप्रकृति, क्रमावस्था and सन्धि Now, the five अर्थप्रकृति or elements of the plot in their succession are as

* रसो वै स । रस ह्येवाय लब्ध्वाऽऽनन्दीभवति । (तैत्तिरीयोपनिषद्).

† Some English equivalents to Sanskrit terms in dramaturgy have henceforth been borrowed from the English Translation of the दशरूपक by George C O Haas 1912, (U S A.)

follows—(1) बीज or the *germ* indicates the beginning of the dramatic action. (2) बिन्दु or the *drop* is the *expansion* of the plot through the introduction of a subordinate element. This element disturbs the main plot, yet it maintains its continuity just like a drop of oil spreading on the surface of water. (3) पताका (episode), which is different from पताका-स्थानक (the dramatic irony of situation and words), is the spreading (expansion) of the plot still further like a fluttering banner, owing to the introduction of other subordinate elements aiding the main action. (4) प्रकरी (episodical incident) is almost the same as पताका; yet introducing a new subordinate element and occupying a short interval of time, it comes to a quick close. (5) कार्य is the *de'nouement* or conclusion, where the action of the plot reaches a successful end.

The five कार्यावस्था or psychological stages, which the drama undergoes are, in their proper sequence, the following ones-(1) आरम्भ is the *beginning*, where the ardent desire of a character in the drama for the achievement of the fruit or result (फलागम) is expressed for the first time. (2) यत्न is the *effort* or determined activity for the attainment of the fruit. (3) प्राप्त्याशा is the *expectation* of attaining the result, or the prospect of success. (4) नियताप्ति shows *surety of success* after the removal of obstacles in the way. (5) फलागम is the actual attainment of the fruit or result. All these psychological stages of the Action are calculated to maintain interest and hold

the audience in suspense up to the conclusion, by introducing the novelty of the subordinate matter every time The five अर्थप्रकृतिs in alliance with the five अवस्थाs constitute the five सन्धिs or junctures of a play.

The five सन्धिs corresponding to the respective अर्थप्रकृतिs and अवस्थाs in their order are as follows—(1) मुखसन्धि is the *opening* (आरम्भ) *of the action, where* the seed (बीज) of the plot being sown, interest is awakened in the minds of spectators (2) प्रतिमुखसन्धि (*progression*), which arises from the combination of बिन्दु and यत्न, is the sprouting of the seed or development *of the plot owing to the introduction of a* subordinate and disturbing element (बिन्दु). This element shows *the concentrated effort* (यत्न) *of the* characters and spectators to reach the goal (3) गर्भसन्धि is the further *development* of the plot containing the element of पताका. Here the hope of attaining the fruit (प्राप्त्याशा) is aroused by introducing new subordinate matter (पताका) and by indicating possibilities of success. (4) विमर्श or अवमर्श सन्धि indicates a short *pause* or *check* in the action of the plot, *on account of some unexpected obstacle or an episo*dical incident (प्रकरी), which being at last set aside, *surety of attaining the fruit or result* (नियताप्ति) is hinted at. (5) निर्वहणसन्धि signifies the *conclusion*(कार्य) of the plot brought about by the *organization of* several episodes of the drama with the main plot. It creates a *synthetic* and *lasting impression* on the

minds of spectators and shows the actual attainment of the fruit or result (फलागम). Thus all the सन्धिs serve to maintain the unity of the dramatic action by establishing organization between the minor and major parts of the plot. [भ. नाट्यशास्त्र, अ. २१; दशरूपक, प्र. १].

These अर्थप्रकृतिs, अवस्थाs and सन्धिs with their five respective sub-divisions, viz., the corresponding elements, stages and junctures can be thus represented in a tabular form:—

अर्थप्रकृतयः	१ बीजम्	२ बिन्दुः	३ पताका	४ प्रकरी	५ कार्यम्
अवस्थाः	१ आरम्भः	२ यत्नः	३ प्राप्त्याशा	४ नियताप्तिः	५ फलागमः
↓ सन्धयः	१ मुखम् Opening	२ प्रतिमुखम् Progression	३ गर्भः Development	४ विमर्शः (अवमर्शः) Pause	५ निर्वहणम् (उपसहृतिः) Conclusion ↓

According to भरत each सन्धि, except the first consisting of *twleve* sub-divisions (सन्ध्यङ्गs) is to be subdivided into *thirteen*, so that all सन्ध्यङ्गs can be enumerated to be *sixty-four*.* Detailed treatment of these sub-divisions is needless here. Suffice it to say that even those sub-divisions present a psychological aspect. All these अर्थप्रकृतिs, अवस्थाs and सन्धिs with their sixty-four sub-divisions have been laid down by भरत for the methodical

* The sub-divisions of सन्धिs according to the दशरूपक are— 12 + 13 + 12 + 13 + 14 = 64

representation of a drama. Strict adherence to these सन्धि and their sub-divisions (सन्ध्यङ्ग s) is not obligatory on dramatists, since slavish observance *of rules or technique mars the originality of a dramatist or a poet,* and obstructs the flight of his Imagination. भरत intelligently allows a dramatist sufficient discretion to write his play. For, he himself says in the नाट्यशास्त्र—

> इत्येतानि यथासन्धि कार्याण्यङ्गानि रूपके ।
> कविभिः कार्यकुशलै रसभावानवेक्ष्य तु ॥
> सर्वाङ्गानि कदाचित्तु द्वित्रियोगेन वा पुनः
> ज्ञात्वा कार्यमवस्थां च योज्यान्यङ्गानि सन्धिषु ॥
>
> —भ. नाट्यशास्त्रम्, २१।१०६-१०७

"Thus the poets skilled in dramatic composition should use in dramas the sub-divisions (सन्ध्यङ्ग) in proper relation to their respective सन्धि; but they should use them with their *attention mainly to the predominant sentiments.* They may optionally utilize the sub-divisions of सन्धि, either in their entirety or in their combinations of two or three; *but they may do so with full knowledge of the de'nouement* and psychological stages of the drama."

It must, therefore, be noted that this methodology of सन्धि and सन्ध्यङ्ग is not meant simply to exalt the *theory* of the dramatic science. In the successful composition and presentation *of a play,* i. e., in actual *practice,* it is meant to serve as a means to the chief end, which is the enhancement

of रस. This enhancement of रस might be psychologically termed 'awakening of curiosity' or 'heightening of interest' coupled with the clear comprehension of any subject dealt with. With the same purpose in view the author of the ध्वन्यालोक says as follows—

> सन्धिसन्ध्यङ्गघटनं रसाभिव्यक्त्यपेक्षया।
> न तु केवलया शास्त्रस्थितिसम्पादनेच्छया॥
>
> —ध्वन्यालोकः; ३।१२

"The combination of सन्धिs and सन्ध्यङ्गs, in the setting of a play, must be made not only with the view of conforming to the technique of dramaturgy or maintaining the dignity of that science, but mainly with the view of developing and manifesting the रस in a successful manner."

The same valuable suggestions are applicable to the use of अलङ्कारs (figures), रीति (diction), and गुणs (excellences) in the composition of a drama and other varieties of poetry. A dramatist or a poet can, therefore, get full scope for his originality, wit, poetic ideas, constructive skill, etc., in spite of the minute details of those rules. All these thoughts hold good even in the science of teaching. A teacher likewise may conform to the technique of teaching, yet he must bear in mind that all this technique is a means to the 'interest' to be aroused among students in the subject dealt with. He should not slavishly follow the technique of teaching, but must have his eye fixed on *Interest*, so that he would get full scope for

the free exhibition of his tact, humour, clear treatment of his subject, and other factors of good teaching. The five सन्धि are the actual method of *dramatic demonstration through which a dramatist,* actors and spectators have consecutively to pass according to the heightening of their emotions and sentiments. *The principle of* सन्धि, therefore, may be resorted to, according to the rules of dramaturgy, as much by *teachers as* by dramatists and actors, when a predominantly emotional subject is to be demonstrated before a psychological group of students or spectators. In this respect, the plot (वस्तु) of *a drama* may correspond *to* the emotional subject to be taught, an actor to a teacher, spectators to students, and the five सन्धि to the five steps of teaching. Thus the five सन्धि can very well be turned into the five psychological steps of a 'literature' lesson, *though we have not* come across references, in ancient works, to their employment in teaching. It is not known for certain whether the सन्धि were adopted as steps of teaching literature or not, when the emotional aspect was prominent. There is, however, no reason why we should not adopt these सन्धि as *steps of teaching literature* or any subject worthy of being dealt with on the emotional level.

It is worthy of note in this respect *that* भरत's theory of रस was originally meant for the dramatic representation. *Later literary critics* like रुद्रभट्ट and आनन्दवर्धन, however, finding the predominant ele-

ment of रस common to the drama as well as poetry, have applied that theory without any modification to poetry and its composition. रुद्रभट्ट says in his शृङ्गारतिलक as follows—

> प्रायो नाट्यं प्रति प्रोक्ता भरताद्यैः रसस्थितिः ।
> यथामति मयाप्येषा काव्यं प्रति निगद्यते ॥
>
> —शृङ्गारतिलक, १।५

" Generally भरत and others have expounded the theory of रस with reference to the dramatic representation. I treat of it, as far as my power of judgment permits me, with reference to poetry. "

When these facts are taken into account, it is no violation of the ancient literary principles, if the theory of junctures (सन्धिs) is made applicable to the theory and practice of teaching *literature* without changing in the least the original meanings of the words : मुख, प्रतिमुख, गर्भ, विमर्श and निर्वहण. It is obvious that the emotional teaching of literature involves the same psychological stages and junctures, which are in every way applicable to the interesting exposition of literature by the teacher before the ' psychological group ' of students.

Again भरत enumerates six purposes of the employment of सन्ध्यङ्गs (sub-divisions). Those purposes, though they are applicable to the composition and representation of the drama, are also worthy of being always borne in mind by a teacher while actually presenting the subject-matter to his students. The purposes are—

इष्टस्यार्थस्य रचना वृत्तान्तस्यानुपक्षयः ।
रागप्राप्तिः प्रयोगस्य गुह्यानां चैव गूहनम् ॥
आश्चर्यवदभिख्यानं प्रकाश्यानां प्रकाशनम् ।
अङ्गानां षड्विधं ह्येतदुक्तं शास्त्रे प्रयोजनम् ॥

—भ. नाट्यशास्त्रम्, २१।५३–५४

"(1) Arrangement of the subject-matter intended to be presented, (2) uninterrupted continuity of the topic, (3) maintenance of interest (राग) in the presentation, (4) concealment of the things that ought to be concealed, (5) addressing the audience in such a way that their curiosity or surprise would be aroused, and (6) disclosure of the things to be disclosed—these are the six purposes of the sub-divisions in this dramatic science." धनञ्जय, after reproducing *the same six purposes of the sub-divisions in his* दशरूपक *(I. 55), gives the following valuable suggestions regarding the presentation of the subject-matter—*

द्वेधा विभागः कर्तव्यः सर्वस्यापीह वस्तुनः ।
सूच्यमेव भवेत्किञ्चिद् दृश्यश्रव्यमथापरम् ॥
नीरसोऽनुचितस्तत्र संसूच्यो वस्तुविस्तरः ।
दृश्यस्तु मधुरोदात्तरसभावनिरन्तरः ॥

—दशरूपकम्, १।५६-५७

"The whole subject-matter should be divided into two parts. Some of it should be suggested by incidental reference, and the other should be witnessed and heard by the audience. Details of the *subject-matter that are devoid of charm and propriety should be incidentally referred to; and what*

is full of sweet and sublime emotions and sentiments should be presented in detail."

In the science of dramaturgy similar verses are found which can be applied to teaching without modifying their meanings. From all that has been said above it will be clear that classification of the subject-matter, nomenclature, definition, ascertainment of the relative worth of principal and subordinate elements, and organization of all the elements into a systematic or synthetic whole are the *distinguishing features of methodology*, which is not only applicable to the नाट्यशास्त्र but is of wider application to all the शास्त्रs in India. Logic has particularly helped the development of the methodology by enunciating its principles of उद्देश (Enumeration), लक्षण (Definition) and परीक्षा (Examination), as we have already seen. The नाट्यशास्त्र besides methodically and psychologically setting forth its general *theory* concerns itself more with its actual *practice* on the stage. This is why it lays down principles for the organization of the subject-matter according to its essential and non-essential elements, and also for its beautiful presentation which would charm the minds of spectators. Those psychological principles are, therefore, applicable in many respects to the art of teaching, and give us valuable hints for the formulation of the theory of teaching according to the Hindu ideas, and for the use of that theory in actual practice.

Along this line of thought it is interesting to note how a new drama is acted between the Subject

(विषयी, द्रष्टा) and the Object (विषय, दृश्य) in interchanging their places and assuming different roles The author of Dramaturgy like भरत, who is the 'Subject', assumes the role of a teacher in relation to the psychological group of dramatists, who are objectified by him, while a dramatist who was formerly objectified becomes now the 'Subject' and assumes the role of a teacher in relation to the *Dramatis Personae* On the other hand, the *Dramatis Personae* while acting a drama become the 'Subject' and assume the role of teachers in relation to the spectators, who are for some time objectified into a psychological group The spectators while passively witnessing a drama and enjoying the रस are transformed into the 'Subject' and objectify the actors and the whole dramatic performance If we thus find that all this is a play or communion between the 'Subject' and the 'Object', and if Interest' (राग or रस) is heightened in the *psychic union of the 'Subject' and the 'Object'*, there need be no objection if we extend the same relation of the 'Subject' and the 'Object' to the teacher and the taught respectively *It may be added here that a teacher* assumes, or ought to assume, the role of an actor in relation to his students, who are objectified by him and who play the part of the audience or a psychological group A teacher teaching a drama or any emotional subject must, therefore, possess some dramatic sense for making his teaching *interesting and instructive, and for this purpose* he may follow some dramatic principles in practice,

and adopt the पञ्चसन्धि in the drama as the five steps of teaching literature

Just as the teacher and the taught are required, for the study of intellectual subjects (शास्त्र), to adopt five or three steps of the 'Logical Method' as previously indicated similarly the teachers may take the five सन्धि of the drama to be a distinguishing feature of the 'Psychological Method', and may resort to them for the teaching of Literature and other emotional subjects to advanced students in an interesting and instructive manner All this will clearly show that the Hindu thinkers took recourse not only to the 'Logical Method' but also to the 'Psychological Method In other words they based the presentation of their subjects on the findings of their own Logic as well as Psychology The former has accepted Causal Relation Categories, Inference and Joint Method of Agreement and Difference (अन्वय-व्यतिरेक) as the chief modes of thinking and reasoning while the latter suggests principles of education which are based on the mind of the Individual as well as of the Group

---

III THE METHODS OF LOGIC (न्याय)

The distinction between the 'Psychological Method' and the 'Logical Method' may be noted here The Psychological Method is the practical application of the general principles of psychology,

which deals with the phenomena or the actual working of the three aspects of the mind, viz, Affection, Cognition and Conation In this sense psychology is a theoretical science inasmuch as it is concerned with mental states as they actually exist and develop in Nature. Psychology, however, forms the basis of practical sciences, which regulate and lead the powers of the mind to a worthy goal and help the development of *Personality*, *which is a complete whole of affection, cognition and conation The practical sciences are, for instance Education, Aesthetics, Logic, etc, out of which Education is concerned with the sublimation of all the mental powers and is thus closely related to psychology. Aesthetics and literary criticism are prominently related to the affective aspect of the mind, and their goal is the attainment of Aesthetic Delight. Logic, on the other hand, is based on the cognitive aspect of the mind, and its goal is to train us in the art of correct thinking It will be then clear that* the practical approach made to a subject after taking into account the three aspects of the mind may be called the 'Psychological Method', while the purely cognitive approach to a subject may be termed the 'Logical Method'.

This does not, of course, mean that the Psychological Method is illogical or that the Logical Method is unpsychological Although both are complementary to each other, yet according to the growing understanding of a young learner the Psychological Method, which is based on the natural growth or evolution of the three aspects

of the mind, is more effective than the Logical Method, which, being concerned mainly with generalized or ideal thought, becomes abstract and unintelligible. The learning process of a child according to psychology continues through the stages of sense-perception, repeated observation (भूयोदर्शन) of particulars, recognition of similarity and contrast, recapitulation of former experience, organization of all facts, and generalization. In short, he starts from the particular to the general through the process of Induction. Here the Psychological Method culminates, and must culminate, in the Logical Method, for the purpose of giving a finished form to the knowledge imparted and to the method of its imparting. Induction must be verified by Deduction and recapitulation, or analysis must be followed by synthesis. In other words, *the best method will be analytico-synthetic* rather than purely analytic or synthetic. A young learner who has reached the stage of generalization may, if he chooses, dispense with the Psychological Method and resort to the Logical one. It must, however, be remembered that even in the case of novices advanced in age Psychological Method, which is concrete and interesting on account of its appeal to emotions and imagination, serves its purpose more than the Logical Method.

Though Logic, which is related to cognition, may form a branch of psychology, it has established its independence as a separate science, and also helps psychology in return. It not only systematizes

psychology but *from the cognitive point of view* analyses any subject into principal and subordinate parts and organizes it into a system or united whole This is why Logic and the Logical Method have occupied a *more prominent* place than psychology among all sciences even from ancient times in the East as well as in the West Another reason of the prominence of Logic is that it is primarily concerned with correct thinking or valid knowledge (प्रमा) and secondarily with incorrect thinking or fallacies as well as forms of invalid knowledge (अप्रमा), so that we should avoid or dispel the latter and resort only to the former, while psychology deals with correct *as well as incorrect processes of thinking feeling* and willing as they actually take place in our mind. Logic does not, therefore, deal with ' thought ' as it is but expresses its thoughts about the ideal and general thought or ' thought ' as it *ought to be*, by regulating its natural *process* It analyses 'thought' into Concept, Judgment and Inference, clarifies *relations* between the *objects of knowledge* (प्रमेय) and their symbols (words etc) or between a thought and another thought, demonstrates the ideal process or method of acquiring *valid* knowledge by stating the instruments or *means of valid knowledge* (प्रमाण), and lays *down rules* for the *attainment of Truth,* which is the common goal of all sciences For this purpose it resorts to the *classification* of things and *nomenclature* suited to particular aims, and lays down a *procedure,* which is either deductive or inductive. When the various

relations between the objects of valid knowledge and their symbols are made known through this procedure, explanation of a subject assumes a methodical and scientific aspect Although Logic is generally a practical science, its treatment of the laws of concept, judgment and inference forms its theory or the first part, and the knowledge of that theory leads us to its second part, viz, the *scientific theory of method* or *methodology* This methodology of Logic is of universal application to all branches of human knowledge viz psychology, metaphysics, linguistics, chemistry, medical science, education, etc, since it enables us to expound those subjects in a methodical way In other words, methodology maintains clarity of thought by distinguishing between the primary and secondary elements of a subject and by organizing those elements into a proportioned whole or a System Moreover, it develops critical insight so as to enable us to discard fallacious reasoning or invalid knowledge and accept valid knowledge alone The Logical Method may, therefore be called the 'scientific' or 'critical' method of arriving at correct conclusions for the attainment of Truth

'Truth' is that which remains unchanged under varying circumstances, and a new fact, that is found to be consistent with it, assumes the form of truth The method, therefore, that facilitates approach to that truth after making us discard the non-essential and ascertain the essential is the best method This method comprises the processes of logical *analysis* and *synthesis* of observed facts

that conduce to the systematic knowledge of a particular subject Analysis involves the separation of the individual parts of a united whole through the processes of observation, experiment, guarded use of hypothesis, analogy, isolation of necessary facts from unnecessary ones, establishment of a law owing to the causal relation revealed, and the act of connecting this law with the universal law of wider generality This scientific process of analysis, through which we arrive at the universal from the particular, is otherwise called 'Induction' On the other hand if we, after assuming the exist ence of the universal law, apply it to particular facts, we have to resort to the synthesis of particulars or parts into a systematized whole, on account of the common relation of the parts This is other wise called ' Deduction ' or the method of starting from the universal to the particular Bacon and Mill discard this deductive procedure by saying that it adds nothing new to our knowledge, and establish the Inductive Method as the only Scientific Method It must, however, be noted that Induction and Deduction, or analysis and synthesis, are both complementary to each other For, mere analysis of facts cannot lead us to the organization and recon struction of parts, unless we have some idea of the whole, while it is not possible to systematize the whole unless we fully know the parts and their relations Analysis serves its purpose best when the parts or constituent elements of a fact can be synthesized and reconstructed into their original whole just as the separation of the parts of a clock serves its

purpose when those several parts are reconstructed into the original clock. Analysis is interested in the concrete reality of particular facts, while synthesis is concerned with the abstract generality of the universals. Synthesis verifies the hypothesis in the light of the universal law and fills in the gaps left by analysis. Thus when synthesis or deduction is combined with analysis or induction, it becomes a sound foundation for the advancement of knowledge. It is the business of Logic to deal with both these procedures, which in their combined form supply us with a complete *scientific explanation*, and which may be designated as the 'Logical Method.'

The completeness or incompleteness of synthesis will depend upon the more or less perfect knowledge gained about a subject. If the universal laws derived from analysis can be applied without contradiction (व्यभिचार) to new cases, the synthesis may be said to be almost perfect and the scientific explanation of the truth aimed at would be complete in the same proportion. When we thus derive one truth from another either through induction or deduction, we have invariably to resort to *inference*, which is one of the chief features of the Logical Method. If the conclusion is inevitably arrived at after following the natural sequence of all the premises, the process of inference becomes complete, and a particular principle or doctrine is said to be established, inasmuch as it is supported by sound reasons (हेतु) in favour of it. Analysis dis-

closes to us the mutual relations of particular facts and leads us through inductive inference to the universals, which supply a sound basis for deductive inference or synthesis

When all the universals or general truths are incorporated by synthesis in a united whole so as to form an organization of parts with parts, and of subordinate parts with the principal part on account of relations existing among all, they develop into a system or शास्त्र, which facilitates inference or the process of reasoning The idea of the whole then helps us to understand the parts related to it, while the knowledge of the parts gives us the idea of the whole, as the parts are related to it It is only the *relations* existing between the parts and the whole that make us understand the nature of both of them Demonstration of the *causal relation* of a part with another part, of a part with the whole, or of a new principle with the already existing system necessarily involves inference and is called 'scientific explanation' The scientific explanation becomes perfect when it is consistent with truth, when it is supported by laws underlying Nature, and when it can find a proper place in a synthetic system If '*science*' *means exact and systematized knowledge*,' the scientific explanation must stand the test of truth and must ensue as a necessary consequence or uncontradicted conclusion from the previously accumulated knowledge

It will be found from what has been said above that Methodology, which is a part of Logic, supplies

us with the rules of method which ought to be followed for the adoption of a systematic procedure in the investigation and treatment of any branch of knowledge. *Analysis* of a subject into major and minor parts and *synthesis* of all the parts into a united whole are, therefore, the general features of the method to be adopted. *The first rule of method then is distinctness and unity of purpose or aim,* which ought to be constantly kept in view for lending unity to the subject-matter and for analysing and organizing the subject-matter in the light of that unity. *The second rule is the ascertainment of the starting-point.* This rule includes (1) the correct and complete comprehension of facts through direct observation and indirect testimony, (2) interpretation and explanation of individual facts by relating them to the universal law, (3) demonstration of the *relation* existing among universal laws, (4) application of those laws in new spheres, (5) subordination of those laws to more universal laws and (6) mental construction of an organized body of knowledge. In all this process it is necessary to proceed with caution and graded steps.

The four famous rules of method laid down by Descartes for his own guidance convey the same purport and are as follows—

"The *first*, never to accept anything for true which I did not clearly know to be such; that is to say, carefully to avoid precipitancy and prejudice, and to comprise nothing more in my judgment than what was presented to my mind so clearly and distinctly as to exclude all ground of doubt.

"The *second*, to divide each of the difficulties under examination into as many parts as possible, and as might be necessary for its adequate solution.

"The *third*, to conduct my thoughts in such order that, by commencing with objects the simplest and easiest to know, I might ascend by little and little, and, as it were, step by step, to the knowledge of the more complex; assigning in thought a certain order even to those objects which in their own nature do not stand in a relation of antecedence and sequence.

"And the *last*, in every case to make enumerations so complete, and reviews so general, that I might be assured that nothing was omitted."*

In short, "The essence of all the rules may be summed up in the directions to make sure of our starting-point, to know the end we wish to attain, and to go from the starting-point to that end by orderly and consecutive steps, each of which is seen in its true relation to all the rest of the enquiry."†

All these rules of methodology laid down by the Western Logic are applicable not only to education but to the investigation into any system or branch of science. Almost the same rules of methodology are found in the Indian Logic (न्याय), which bears a striking resemblance to the Western Logic, not on account of mutual borrowing, but on account of the sameness of the human mind every-

*See Descartes, Discourse on Method, Part II, pp. 15, 16.

†An Intermediate Logic, by Welton and Monahan.

where, and the same process of reasoning from the universal to the particular or from the particular to the universal. All the orthodox and heterodox systems of philosophy in India have accepted the general principles of reasoning or laws of thought set forth by the न्याय system as a means of methodical approach to the truths aimed at in their respective systems. Although the वेदान्तिन्स generally show the futility of logic in the realization of ब्रह्मन् or the ultimate reality†, they employ the logical terminology and 'Inference' in their argumentation to such a degree that many sentences in the भाष्य of शङ्कराचार्य, for instance, can be easily turned into the form of a syllogism. The later Vedant works like the भामती, the अद्वैतसिद्धि and the वेदान्तपरिभाषा are prominently couched in the language of the न्याय system, and prove, on the empirical plane (व्यावहारिक सत्ता), the वेदान्त doctrines in the light of the प्रमाण (means of knowledge) propounded by the न्याय. Thus the Indian Logic is much similar to the Western Logic in the matter of the general acceptance of its methodology by other Indian systems.

Another point of similarity between the Western and Eastern Logic is the close correspondence of their syllogisms, which are a developed form of the 'Dialectic Method' or the method of [illegible] used before their coming into being. Just as

† See the ब्रह्मसूत्र '[illegible] विरोधप्रसङ्गः' (2. 1-11) and the [illegible]

Aristotle's syllogism is a systematized form of the 'Dialectic Method' used by his predecessors like the Sophists, Socrates and Plato (in his Dialogues'), so गौतम's five-membered syllogism, which was reduced to that of three members by the later नैयायिकs, is the development of the *Dialectic Method* used before him in the ancient debates held in sacrificial sessions and philosophical assemblies (परिषद्s) *This method of dialogue is sufficiently* exemplified in the उपनिषद्s and corroborated by the rules of debate (सम्भाषाविधि) collected in the चरकसंहिता (अ ८, विमानस्थान) The *method of dialogue* of which the logical syllogism is a finished form, is necessarily a *method of questions and answers* going on between the पूर्वपक्षिन् and the सिद्धान्तिन् or between the teacher and the taught Thus every premise of the Indian syllogism is an answer to a question asked by an opponent or a student For instance, the hackneyed syllogism of the न्याय implies questions and may be expressed in the form of questions and answers as follows "किमुच्यते? पर्वतो वह्निमान् । कस्मात्? धूमवत्त्वात् । किमुदाहरणम्? यो यो धूमवान् स स वह्निमान्, यथा महानस । किं तर्हि? वह्निव्याप्यधूमवानयं पर्वत । किं सिद्धम्? पर्वतो वह्निमान् ।" This method was much used in ancient times for oral discussions and for the teaching of a subject, and has got its *written evidence in the commentary literature* on शास्त्रs and काव्यs, as will be shown later on Moreover, पक्ष, साध्य and हेतु, the constituents of the Indian syllogism correspond respectively *to* the minor term, major term and the middle term of

Aristotle's syllogism The Indian syllogism is not, however, a process of purely deductive inference like that of Aristotle, but is a process of deductive-inductive inference, since the 'उदाहरण' in it supplies us with the particular, observed facts leading us to the general proposition, as previously indicated Thus the Indian Logic and the Western Logic are identical in the treatment of *inference, definitions, classification and even inductive procedure*

Although the Indian Logic (न्याय) deals incidentally with psychology, theory of knowledge, language, theology, etc , the greater part of it is properly concerned with the cognitive aspect of the mind, since it is usually detailed under the general heading of बुद्धि or Reason, which is the instrument of valid knowledge (प्रमा) as distinguished from invalid knowledge (अप्रमा) The purpose or aim (प्रयोजन) of all valid knowledge distinctly kept in view by the न्याय, as it is done by all Indian systems, is emancipation (मोक्ष) It is, therefore, the task of the न्याय principally to approach valid knowledge or truth which leads to मोक्ष गौतम, therefore, proposes to treat of this valid knowledge through the enumeration (उद्देश) and classification of sixteen topics (पदार्थ)*, of which the first two, viz., प्रमाण (means of valid knowledge) and प्रमेय (objects of valid

---

* प्रमाण-प्रमेय-संशय-प्रयोजन-दृष्टान्त-सिद्धान्त-अवयव-तर्क-निर्णय-वाद-जल्प-वितण्डा-हेत्वाभास-छल-जाति-निग्रहस्थानानां तत्त्वज्ञानान्निःश्रेयसाधिगमः ॥ —न्या. सू. १-१-१

knowledge) are the most important. Again, between these two topics 'प्रमाण' *is held to be more important,* since it facilitates methodical approach to knowledge, and this accounts for a large portion devoted to the treatment of प्रमाण्s in later works on the न्याय. The establishment of the प्रमेय through the *detailed discussion of the* प्रमाण्s is the common feature of all scientific systems in India and it was adopted by them from the methodology of the न्याय, though there are conflicting views among them as regards the number of प्रमाण्s and प्रमेय्s. The number *of प्रमाण्s varies with every system, in spite of the* general acceptance of the four प्रमाण्s of the नैयायिक्s by the important Indian systems The प्रमाण्s recognized by the Indian systems are as follows-(1) The चार्वाक्s accept only *one* प्रमाण, viz , प्रत्यक्ष (Perception). (2) The वैशेषिक्s *and* बौद्ध्s *accept two* प्रमाण्s, viz , प्रत्यक्ष (Perception) and अनुमान (Inference). (3) The साङ्ख्य्s accept *three,* viz , प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान and शब्द (Verbal testimony). The जैन्s seem to accept the same प्रमाण्s though their classification of प्रमाण्s is based on a different *principle* (4) The नैयायिक्s recognize *four,* viz , प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान, शब्द and उपमान (Comparison). (5) The प्राभाकर-मीमांसक्s recognize *five, viz ,* प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान, शब्द, उपमान and अर्थापत्ति (Presumption). (6) The भाट्टमीमांसक्s sanction *six,* viz , प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान, शब्द, उपमान, अर्थापत्ति and अनुपलब्धि (Non-apprehension) The वेदान्तिन्s accept the same प्रमाण्s on the phenomenal plane (व्यावहारिक सत्ता) *for the establishment of their doctrines,* as

is evidenced by the वेदान्तपरिभाषा. Moreover, they add अनुभवप्रमाण (Transcendental realization) as the foremost of all from the point of view of the Absolute State (पारमार्थिकसत्ता). (7) The पौराणिक accept *eight*, viz., प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान, शब्द, उपमान, अर्थापत्ति, अनुपलब्धि, सम्भव (Probability) and ऐतिह्य (Tradition). $ The नैयायिक, however, establish only four प्रमाणs, since they show that 'ऐतिह्य' can be included in शब्द and अर्थापत्ति, सम्भव and अनुपलब्धि in अनुमान. The definitions (लक्षण) and critical examination of those four प्रमाणs and more particulary of Inference (अनुमान) occupy a major part of the न्याय system. For, it is said that a thing or principle can be established by definitions and means of proof and not by a mere statement (न हि प्रतिज्ञामात्रेण वस्तुसिद्धिः। लक्षणप्रमाणाभ्यां वस्तुसिद्धिः), or that the establishment of an object of knowledge depends upon the *means* of knowledge (मानाधीना मेयसिद्धिः). The नैयायिक have shown critical acumen and power of minute analysis in the enumeration (उद्देश) and classification of categories and their subdivisions, in the definitions (लक्षण) of the same and in the examination (परीक्षा) of those definitions, which are demonstrated to be correct after indicating the propriety of each word in them

$ प्रत्यक्षमेकं चार्वाकाः कणादसुगतौ पुनः। अनुमानं च तच्चापि सांख्याः शब्दं च ते अपि ॥१७॥ न्यायैकदेशिनोऽप्येवमुपमानं च केचन। अर्थापत्त्या सहैतानि चत्वार्याह प्रभाकरः ॥१८॥ अभावषष्ठान्येतानि भाट्टा वेदान्तिनस्तथा। सम्भवैतिह्ययुक्तानि तानि पौराणिका जगुः ॥१९॥

—सुरेश्वराचार्यकृत मानसोल्लासवार्तिकम्, द्वितीयोल्लासः।

and avoiding the faults of अव्याप्ति (non-pervasion), अतिव्याप्ति (over-extension) and असम्भव (non-existence). Examination (परीक्षा) includes also the establishment of the existence or non-existence of things or categories by applying the tests of four proofs (प्रमाण). This *three-fold logical method of exposition* is not only employed throughout all the न्याय works, but is adopted by other schools of thought for the systematic treatment of their respective tenets.

Thus the later नैयायिक्स focussed their attention only on the theory of proofs (प्रमाण्स) to the exclusion of the remaining fifteen topics of गौतम, and accepting the seven 'वैशेषिक' categories (पदार्थ) with their subdivisions, as a complete and minute analysis or classification of things in the universe, they included in them the sixteen topics of गौतम.* Now the seven categories of the वैशेषिक्स are द्रव्य (Substance), गुण (Quality), कर्मन् (Action), सामान्य (Generality), विशेष (Particularity), समवाय (Inherence) and अभाव (Negation). These categories have further been subdivided into *nine* द्रव्यs, *twenty-four* गुणs, *five* forms of कर्मन्, *two* kinds of सामान्य, innumerable विशेषs, *one* समवाय, and *four* kinds of अभाव. Those categories with their subdivisions have been more or *less accepted by other Indian systems as the starting-point of*

* सर्वेषां पदार्थानां यथायथमुक्तेष्वन्तर्भावात्सप्तैव पदार्था इति सिद्धम्।
—तर्कसङ्ग्रह, ७०.

their speculations, and can most favourably compare with Aristotle's categories. It may incidentally *be remarked here that even the* साङ्ख्यs, like वैशेषिकs, have attempted a complete classification of things in the universe. Their twenty-five categories, which mark graded stages in the psychological and physical evolution of the universe, and which can also favourably compare with the 'Evolution Theory' in the West, have generally influenced other Indian systems. They have been amalgamated with the Upanishadic philosophy, in spite of difference as to the Ultimate Reality, by philosophers like शङ्कराचार्य as the starting-point of their philosophical enquiry.$ It can, therefore, be said that along with the वैशेषिकs and the नैयायिकs the साङ्ख्यs also have contributed much to the methodical treatment of शास्त्र.

In connection with the etymological explanation of the word 'प्रमाण' as 'प्रमायाः करणम्' (the instrument of valid knowledge), the word 'करण' (instrument) is explained in the न्याय system as 'व्यापारवदसाधारणं कारणम्' (a peculiar and operative cause), and the theory of Causal Relation, which prominently presents a scientific aspect to the explanation of phenomena, is further detailed. The cause is defined in the न्याय as that which invariably and immediately precedes its effect and which is not proved to be a superfluous and accidental circumstance; while the *effect* is that which

$ येन त्वंशेन न विरुध्येते तेनेष्टमेव साङ्ख्ययोगस्मृत्योः सावकाशत्वम्।
—ब्र. सू. भा. २–१–३

invariably and immediately succeeds the cause which is not proved to be a 'superfluous and accidental circumstance $ In the Indian Logic the superfluous or *extraneous circumstances* (अन्यथासिद्ध) *which* must be excluded from the definition of the cause have been minutely discussed with illustrations. The invariable concomitance of the cause and the effect can be proved only when our experience is *uncontradicted* (अव्यभिचरित) *by a different circumstance* In other words, when we realize uniformity in Nature, or when we have the uniform and uninterrupted experience of agreement in presence and agreement in absence (अन्वयव्यतिरेक), we can establish the *causal relation* (कार्यकारणसम्बन्ध) of *things* Thus the theory of Causation *explained by* the न्याय exactly corresponds to the same expounded by the Western Logic, which defines the cause as "an invariable, unconditional and immediate antecedent of a phenomenon "

The cause is divided by the नैयायिक*s into three* kinds, viz, समवायिकारण (intimate cause), असमवायिकारण (non-intimate cause) and निमित्तकारण (efficient cause) The non-intimate *cause,* which is inseparably connected either with the effect or with the intimate *cause, and which is either an action* (कर्म) *or a* quality (गुण), is an invention of the नैयायिकs and is not accepted by other systems The remaining two kinds, viz, 'समवायिकारण' and 'निमित्तकारण' have been

---

$ अनन्यथासिद्धनियतपूर्वभावित्व कारणत्वम्। अनन्यथासिद्धनियतपश्चाद्भावित्व कार्यत्वम्। —तर्कभाषा.

recognized by the systems like the साङ्ख्य and the वेदान्त for the purpose of explaining the phenomenal reality through actual transformation (परिणाम), and through magic transformation or illusory appearance (विवर्त) respectively, the समवायिकारण being otherwise called 'उपादानकारण' (material cause) by them Thus it will be found that the *Theory of Causation* has become a distinguishing feature of almost all systems of Indian philosophy, which, therefore, may be said to employ the *Scientific Method* in the explanation of their tenets, inasmuch as they accept the causal relation as their starting-point on the phenomenal plane (व्यावहारिक सत्ता), though in the absolute and ineffable state (पारमार्थिक सत्ता) no room is left for the causal or any other relation, and science is bound to give way according to the वेदान्त philsophy

It has formerly been shown that the process of inference in the Indian Logic is not purely deductive but inductive-deductive, on account of the *example* (उदाहरण) that finds its place in the five-membered syllogism (अनुमानवाक्य). It can further be pointed out that the process of arriving at a generalization or invariable concomitance (व्याप्ति) from particular instances as described in the न्याय system * exactly corresponds to the process of Induction in the Western Logic व्याप्ति means invariable and uncondi-

* व्यभिचारस्याग्रहोऽपि सहचारग्रहस्तथा । हेतुर्व्याप्तिग्रहे, तर्कः क्वचिच्छङ्कानिवर्तकः ॥ —सि. मुक्तावलि, १३७.

tional concomitance (उपाधिविधुरं नियतं साहचर्यम्) between two phemomena, one of which is the sign or ground of inference (लिङ्ग, हेतु) like 'smoke' and the other is the thing to be inferred (साध्य) like 'fire'. The relation of invariable concomitance between the हेतु (व्याप्य) and the साध्य (व्यापक) must, therefore, be a natural one (स्वाभाविक), that is, based on the uniformity of Nature, and must be free from conditions (उपाधि) like the contact of wet fuel (आर्द्रेन्धनसंयोग) or contradictory facts (व्यभिचार). We are then enabled to ascertain the अन्वयव्याप्ति viz., 'Wherever there is smoke there is fire' (यत्र यत्र धूमस्तत्र तत्र वह्निः) and the व्यतिरेकव्याप्ति viz, 'Wherever there is the absence of fire, there is the absence of smoke' (यत्र वह्न्यभावस्तत्र धूमाभावः). In other words, the observation of agreement in presence as well as agreement in absence between the हेतु (middle term) and साध्य (major term) is necessary for the purpose of ascertaining व्याप्ति.

This व्याप्ति or generalization is derived from the repeated observation (भूयोदर्शन) of *innumerable particular cases* where smoke and fire co-exist or are associated. But the repeated observation of many particular cases of the co-existence of smoke and fire will be inadequate, if in only one case that association is contradicted (व्यभिचरित). The *observation of the concomitance* (साहचर्य) of smoke and fire must, therefore, be strengthened by the non-observation or absence of a

contrary instance (व्यभिचारादर्शन), where that association is violated. Thus repeated *observation of particular facts* through direct perception enables us to discover the co-existence (साहचर्य) of two phenomena, which being *invariably* and *uninterruptedly* experienced, lead us to the knowledge of their uniformity. When such particular uniformities are known by us, we begin to believe that there is a fixed order of things in Nature, and arrive at the wider laws of Uniformity (स्वाभाविकसम्बन्ध) and Causation (कार्यकारणसम्बन्ध). This belief in uniformity and causation is strengthened by the apprehension of agreement between two phenomena in their presence and absence (अन्वयव्यतिरेक) supported by the non-apprehension of contradiction (व्यभिचाराग्रह). But if the observation of *all* the particulars of a phenomenon is not possible, how are we enabled to reach generalization from a few particulars ? The नैयायिक answer this question by saying that the idea of generality (सामान्यप्रत्यासत्ति), which is really of the nature of immediate inference, is naturally aroused in us by the law of association, as soon as we perceive an individual. No sooner do we perceive an individual cow (गोव्यक्ति) than we realize the class-conception of the cow (गोत्वजाति). It is, therefore, possible to pass from particulars to the general through the *inductive process*, if there is the absence of contradiction (व्यभिचारविरह), which is also determined by means of repeated observation. Repeated observation alone, however, can-

not be the cause of apprehending the invariable concomitance or reaching generalization, for sometimes a single observation of co existence accompanied by the non-observation of contradiction might lead us to generalization (व्याप्ति).

This generalization cannot be reached unless we dispel our doubts with regard to a vicious *condition* (उपाधिशङ्का) *attaching to the middle term* (हेतु) and ultimately leading to a contradiction (व्यभिचार) in the invariable concomitance or co-existance of two phenomena. In other words, the relation between the middle term (हेतु) and the major term (साध्य) must be natural (स्वाभाविक) and not conditional (सोपाधिक), and Induction must proceed as a necessary consequence from particular *facts* *If we, for instance, try to establish the* व्याप्ति 'Wherever, there is fire, there is smoke (यत्र यत्र वह्निस्तत्र तत्र धूम), this concomitance is contradicted by the fact that fire does not invariably co-exist with smoke, as in the case of a red-hot iron-ball, though smoke invariably co-exists with fire *It is not fire but the condition* 'wet fuel' (आर्द्रेन्धन) *that is concomitant with smoke*' It is therefore, necessary to ascertain that the middle term is free from a vicious condition and to dispel our doubt regarding a condition (उपाधि) or contradiction (व्यभिचार) suspected to come in the way of apprehending the invariable concomitance *of two phenomena. If we are certain that a condi*tion or contradiction exists, no invariable concomi-

tance can be apprehended. If, however, there is a doubt regarding either of them, it can be dispelled in two ways. Firstly, a doubt as to a suspected उपाधि or व्यभिचार can be removed by resorting to the method of observing agreement in presence of a thing in the positive instances (अन्वय) and the absence of that thing in the negative instances (व्यतिरेक) between two phenomena. This method, therefore, closely corresponds to the Joint Method of Mill. Secondly, the doubt can be dispelled by adopting तर्क (confutation,) which means 'hypothetical reasoning' or 'the *reductio ad absurdum* method of reasoning'. If our opponent rejects our proposition, we, for a short time, admit for the sake of argument his negation to be true, and show how that negation turned into the form of a regular syllogism results in an absurd conclusion, which contradicts an observed fact. The negation of the opponent is thus indirectly proved to be false and its reverse proposition to be true. For instance, when we prove the presence of fire on the mountain from its observed sign (लिङ्ग, हेतु) 'smoke', and say 'पर्वतो वह्निमान्, धूमवत्त्वात्' by adopting the अन्वयव्याप्ति 'यत्र यत्र धूमस्तत्र तत्र वह्निः', our opponent negates our proposition and says 'पर्वतो वह्न्यभाववान्'. We then deliberately assume for a moment this false statement to be true; in other words, we grant for the sake of argument that 'smoke' is not the effect of the cause 'fire', and that, therefore, smoke does not co-exist with fire though really there is causal relation between smoke and fire. Bearing this fact

in mind we make a hypothetical statement 'यदि पर्वतो वह्निमान् न स्यात् तर्हि स धूमवानपि न स्यात्'. Thus we purposely say 'पर्वतो धूमाभाववान्, वह्न्यभाववत्त्वात्' by resorting to the व्यतिरेकव्याप्ति 'यत्र यत्र वह्न्यभावस्तत्र तत्र धूमाभाव'. But the conclusion 'पर्वतो धूमाभाववान्' cannot be true, since it is contradictory to the actually observed fact of the presence of smoke on the mountain If the opponent persists in his own statement 'पर्वतो वह्न्यभाववान्', he is asked to point out an example wherein smoke can exist without fire Of course as there is causal relation between smoke and fire, the opponent can obviously supply no example wherein smoke and fire do not coexist, and has to acknowledge the absurdity of his own statement 'पर्वतो वह्न्यभाववान्'. He is thus obliged to accept the truth of the व्यतिरेकव्याप्ति 'यत्र यत्र वह्न्यभावस्तत्र तत्र धूमाभाव' and indirectly to consent to the original proposition 'पर्वतो वह्निमान्'.

It must be remembered that this method of confutation (तर्क) does not directly establish the व्याप्ति, but helps us in proving the absence of a contradictory fact by dispelling our doubts regarding a condition (उपाधि) or contradiction (व्यभिचार), and by strengthening our knowledge of coexistence (साहचर्य) which is apprehended by repeated observation Thus 'तर्क', in which the principles of Causation and Uniformity are applied, is a method of the deductive verification of induction Though तर्क is based on false assumption it assists us in arriving

at valid conclusions, which are instrumental to valid knowledge (प्रमा) तर्क is particularly useful where the अन्वयव्याप्ति is not applicable and where a philosophical topic beyond our limited intellect can be explained only by a negative proof (व्यतिरेक) This तर्क, which is based on false assumption, is of five kinds viz, आत्माश्रय (*Ignoratio elenchi*), अन्योन्याश्रय (dilemma), चक्रक (arguing in a circle), अनवस्था (*regressus ad infinitum*) and प्रमाणबाधितार्थप्रसङ्ग (*reductio ad absurdum*), of which the last has been detailed above

It has been noted above that the व्याप्ति must be invariable and unconditional, just as the causal relation must be invariable and unconditional This common feature of both will lead one perhaps to think that every व्याप्ति is based on the causal relation In the particular example of smoke and fire the invariable concomitance of both can be shown to depend on the causal relation But the नैयायिकs think that the causal relation between two phenomena is not quite necessary for every व्याप्ति, and that it is sufficient for the establishment of the व्याप्ति to know the concomitance of two phenomena without a contradictory fact For instance, the invariable concomitance of the rise of the moon and the tide of the ocean is not necessarily based on the causal relation between the two, but depends on our general belief in the *uniformity of Nature* This belief in probability which amounts to certainty makes us ascertain the invariable concomitance

of the two phenomena It may then be said that व्याप्ति depends as much on the principle of the Uniformity of Coexistence as it depends on the principle of Causation. This is somewhat different from, and more comprehensive than, Mill's Method of Agreement and Difference which is based simply on causation

It will then be seen that the process of ascertaining the व्याप्ति or generalization, as described in the न्याय system, is that of pure *Induction* The generalization thus reached serves as a basis for a further deductive inference (अनुमान) which is an instrument of ' judgment ' (अनुमिति) Before we arrive at this अनुमिति through the deductive inference (अनुमान, परामर्श), we have to undergo mainly three mental stages The *first* stage involves the repeated observation of smoke in the kitchen, ascertainment of invariable concomitance or generalization through the knowledge of coexistence, non-observation of a contradiction and approach to a mountain The *second* stage consists of the observation of smoke on the mountain and a doubt about the presence of fire on it At the *third* stage there is the recollection of the generalization already ascertained, and the knowledge of smoke coexisting with fire on the mountain in relation to the generalization. This knowledge of smoke at the third stage is called ' consideration of a sign ' (परामर्श or लिङ्गपरामर्श), from which arises the inference immediately leading to the ' judgment ' (अनुमिति). [तर्कसङ्ग्रह, 41].

Thus *Indian Logic propounds the main principles of general methodology, which being actually applied to the other* शास्त्र *lends a scientific aspect to them.* Indian logicians, however, do not seem to mention 'the experiment' along with repeated observation. Though no definite reference to the Experimental Method can be found in the न्यायवैशेषिक system, it is highly probable that experiments were actually made for the purpose of ascertaining the properties of the ingredients of a compound in the medical and chemical sciences in India. Although Indian Logic does not deal with the Experimental Method, yet it may be remarked that the general methodology, propounded by it, is *thoroughly scientific and critical* even from the Western point of view. In spite of individual differences in their tenets, other Indian systems like the व्याकरण, the मीमांसा, the वेदान्त etc., have found this methodology of the न्याय worthy of general acceptance, and have practically applied it to the methodical exposition of their respective principles. This, doubtless, proves that the modern critical or scientific methods were not non-existent in India as the advocates of Western learning remark, and that the Hindus carried on their investigations into any subject thoroughly on a rational and scientific basis, though they never lost sight of the limitations of Reason in transcendental matters.

With respect to the critical and scientific outlook of the Hindu thinkers it may be added that all

systems of thought in ancient India, orthodox as well as heterodox, try to approach Truth or valid knowledge (प्रमा–यथार्थज्ञान) by resorting to the valid proofs or *means of knowledge* (प्रमाण), *causal relation, repeated observation, inference etc.* How, then, can they be said to be uncritical ? The ancient Indian systems of thought have been critical and scientific enough in their attitude towards valid knowledge, though the experiments made by them might not have been thorough and minute owing to scanty apparatus, in which respect the modern science has undoubtedly made astounding progress With reference to the unbiassed attitude indispensable to a scientist it may be remarked that the modern scientists, who in season and out of season advocate this attitude, are themselves found to be biassed while the ancient thinkers in putting forth their own point of view and refuting others, generally express the objections (पूर्वपक्ष) of others with the veracity of a historian or a modern scientist and give their rejoinders or conclusive view (सिद्धान्त) in a perfectly logical manner, as is exemplified by the शारीरसूत्रभाष्य of श्रीशङ्कराचार्य To be unbiassed is certainly not to abandon one s particular point of view, which would be worthy of standing the test of the valid principles of logic, and faith in the validity of one's own arguments and tenets is scientific enough The only proviso is that this validity must be demonstrated by valid proofs (प्रमाण) and in respect of this scientific attitude the ancient systems of thought are certainly not inferior to the modern ones It

must, however, be acknowledged that modern sciences have gone ahead of the ancient ones on account of their thorough experiments, minute apparatus, and several other means.

IV THE COMMON LITERARY FORMS SUITED TO METHODOLOGY.

In connection with the general methodology of Logic, as detailed above, it is necessary to take into account the three main literary forms, which the Indian systems of thought have adopted for the purpose of methodical exposition, and which have, therefore, contributed to the development of methodology. The three literary forms adopted by almost all systems in India are: (1) the आकरग्रन्थs or the main sources of a system, (2) the वादग्रन्थs or learned disquisitions on the same, and (3) the प्रकरणग्रन्थs or graded manuals for beginners. The आकरग्रन्थs include the सूत्रs or aphorisms, the वार्त्तिकs or works explaining the सूत्रs and supplying their *deficiencies*, and the भाष्यs or original and detailed expositions of the सूत्रs. It is instructive to trace the development of those literary forms from the point of view of methodology.

The Vedic literature, which consists of the संहिताs, ब्राह्मणs, आरण्यकs, and उपनिषद्s grew to an enormous extent owing to the repeated oral discussions

held in learned 'assemblies and in sacrificial sessions For the proper understanding and easy memorization of the main topics in this vast literature and in the oral discussions on it, it became essential to sum up those topics, which, being collected according to their subject-matter, were classified into six वेदाङ्ग s or supplementary treatises on the Vedas, viz, (1) शिक्षा (*Phonetics*), (2) छन्दस् (*Prosody*), (3) कल्प (*Ritual*), (4) निरुक्त (*Etymology*), (5) व्याकरण (*Grammar*), and (6) ज्योतिष (*Astronomy*). *All these* वेदाङ्ग*s, of which the* शिक्षा, *the* निरुक्त *and the* व्याकरण are the branches of the linguistic science, have assumed the unique form of the सूत्र s or aphorisms, which are short and pithy sentences in prose synthesizing the scattered matter on a subject in a systematic form, and which taken collectively develop into a particular system of thought Although those aphorisms *can be easily memorized, and although* clarity (असन्दिग्धत्व) is held to be their distinguishing mark, yet on account of their ambiguity at many places they cannot be fully understood without oral or written explanations. In ancient times, when oral teaching was predominant, those सूत्र s were first learnt by students, and the teachers then gave their *detailed oral explanations, which in later times* were turned into written commentaries or भाष्य s The chief *characteristics of the* सूत्र*-style* are the abundance of the forms of nouns and noun-equivalents, scarcity of verbal forms, purposeful use of particles and case forms like those of the

ablative or the instrumental, and long compounds, which all secured brevity of expression at the cost of clarity, and have immensely influenced Sanskrit Style in the later classical literature. In addition to the व्याकरणसूत्रs of पाणिनि all the six orthodox systems, namely, the सांख्य, the योग, the न्याय, the वैशेषिक, the पूर्वमीमांसा and the उत्तरमीमांसा or वेदान्त and also the heterodox systems like those of the बौद्धs and the जैनs have resorted to this convenient सूत्र-style for the purpose of bringing all their tenets in a condensed form.

The oral explanations of the सूत्रs were later on followed by detailed written explanations or भाष्यs, which besides explaining the सूत्रs expressed the independent views of a commentator, and which incorporated the above characteristics of the सूत्र-style. Again, the भाष्यs account for the logical arrangement and consistency (सङ्गति) of the सूत्रs in topics (अधिकरण), sections (पाद), chapters (अध्याय), and the whole शास्त्र, and further deal generally with each अधिकरण,-which contains one or more सूत्रs,-after distinguishing clearly its five parts, viz. (1) Statement of a topic (विषय), (2) Doubt (संशय), (3) Objection (पूर्वपक्ष), (4) Conclusive answer (सिद्धान्त) and (5) Consistency of the topic with the preceding and succeeding ones (सङ्गति). It should be particularly noted here that the general principles of methodology relating to the function and analysis of individual words (पद), the interpreta-

tion of syntactical unity (वाक्य), and the validity of proofs or means of knowledge (प्रमाण) as laid down respectively by the व्याकरण, the मीमांसा and the न्याय are employed in the भाष्यs at every step, in order to give a complete exposition of a particular शास्त्र Moreover, there are two main types of भाष्यs, viz, (1) those written in the form of *a dialogue or questions and answers*, and (2) *those in the form of a continuous lecture* The first type generally comprises the भाष्य of पतञ्जलि on the व्याकरण, that of शबर on the मीमांसा and that of वात्स्यायन on the न्याय, and all of them are, as it were, written re productions of actual oral discussions, while the second type *in the form of a lecture is represented prominently by* शङ्कराचार्य's वेदान्तसूत्रभाष्य, *which shows* a further development of Sanskrit Style

The भाष्यs, which along with the सूत्रs and वार्तिकs are called 'आकरग्रन्थs', are generally followed by '*वादग्रन्थs*' or *learned disquisitions, which prominently* employ the न्याय-terminology and indulge in *the* minute analysis and hair-splitting distinctions of concepts in order to fortify the tenets of their respective systems The examples of such works are the परिभाषेन्दुशेखर, the शब्देन्दुशेखर, etc, in the व्याकरण, the शास्त्रदीपिका, *the* न्यायरत्न, etc, in the मीमांसा, *the* तत्त्वचिन्तामणि, *the* गदाधरी, *etc, in the* न्याय, *and the* अद्वैतसिद्धि, the खण्डनखण्डखाद्य, etc, in the वेदान्त. The वादग्रन्थs are generally followed by प्रकरणग्रन्थs or manuals which, without making any show of originality and

erudition, merely systematize in brief the tenets of a school in a graded manner, with the view of making them suit the undeveloped understanding of novices. The instances of such works are the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, the lesser कौमुदीs, etc., in the व्याकरण; the आपदेवी, the अर्थसङ्ग्रह, etc., in the मीमांसा; the सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि, the तर्कसङ्ग्रह, etc., in the न्याय; and the पञ्चदशी, the वेदान्तसार, etc., in the वेदान्त. Numerous commentaries on all these types of works, nay, further commentaries on commentaries have come into existence, the ceaseless activity of commentators resulting generally in the simplification or clarification of the original work, or sometimes in making the explanation more difficult than the original! Every system of thought thus seems to have undergone those three broad stages of development, not of course according to the chronological sequence, but according to the sequence of the development of thought. From another point of view also this evolution of an Indian system may be marked through three stages. Thus the composition of the सूत्रs may be called the *first* stage of *Condensation*; the भाष्यs and वादग्रन्थs indicate the *second* stage of *Expansion*; and the प्रकरणग्रन्थs belong to the *third* stage of *Organization*. All this methodical activity was possible only because the exponents of every system placed a *distinct aim* before themselves, possessed a comprehensive *knowledge of the parts and the whole* of a subject, resorted to the *analysis of their subject into main divisions* and sub-divisions, and made a *logical arrangement* of their

analysis of Vedic Collections (संहिता) into individual words (पद), and brought into being the पदपाठ, which is ascribed to शाकल्य This analysis comprises *rules for the separation and formation of the* संधिs of nouns, verbs prepositions and indeclinables in the *Vedic verses,* and *anticipates the* process of 'पदच्छेद' (separation of words) adopted in the later Sanskrit teaching Again, the *minute analysis of sounds* and the *phonetic theory* of Indians compare favourably with the modern Phonetics in the West Along with the शिक्षा school *the attempts of the* नैरुक्तs *(Etymologists) to analyse* Vedic words in the निघण्टु (lists of words) into their crude form (प्रकृति) and affix (प्रत्यय) and to derive nouns from their root-stems can be seen in the निरुक्त of यास्क, who accepted the theory of शाकटायन, viz, '*All nouns can be derived from roots* ,† and gave the etymological explanation of Vedic words after classifying all words in language into *four kinds viz, nouns verbs prepositions and* indeclinables $ and distinguishing the *current* Sanskrit (भाषा) from the Vedic Sanskrit (छन्दस्)

पाणिनि *availed himself of all these attempts of* his predecessors and wrote his अष्टाध्यायी, treating in *full of the current speech* (भाषा) *as well as the* Vedic language (छन्दस्) It is worthy of note what

---

† तत्र नामान्याख्यातजानीति शाकटायनो नैरुक्तसमयश्च । (निरुक्त, १-१२-२) $ तद्यान्येतानि चत्वारि पदजातानि नामाख्याते चोपसर्गनिपाताश्च तानीमानि भवन्ति । (निरुक्त, १-१-८)

Max Muller says about पाणिनि: " The Grammatical system elaborated by native Grammarians, is in itself most perfect, and those who have tested पाणिनि's work will readily admit, that there is no Grammar in any language, that could vie with the wonderful mechanism of his eight books of Grammatical rules." पाणिनि has divided about four thousand सूत्र of his अष्टाध्यायी into eight chapters (अध्याय) of four sections (पाद) each. Although it is not possible to give in short a scheme of those सूत्रs, yet it may be said in general that पाणिनि has devoted his attention to the analysis of words (पदसंस्कार) into their stems (प्रकृति) and affixes (प्रत्यय), by dividing the two chief parts of a sentence into nouns along with nominal derivatives and verbs along with verbal derivatives, and by alternately dealing with those two parts. In this alternate treatment also he begins with a section on verbs and treats of सन्धिs generally in chapters VI and VIII. There is, however, no topical arrangement of the सूत्रs in the अष्टाध्यायी, and the subjectmatter which occurs in the form of incidental digressions or is distantly related to a topic in hand has been inserted in many अध्यायs for the sole purpose of securing brevity of expression. For, the joy experienced in the saving of even half a syllable in the wording of a सूत्र is likened by the grammarians to the joy caused by the birth of a son.$

$ अर्धमात्रालाघवेन पुत्रोत्सवं मन्यन्ते वैयाकरणाः। परि. शेखर, परि. १२२

It should not, however, be supposed that there is no arrangement or method of any kind in the अष्टाध्यायी It may be broadly remarked that पाणिनि arranged the sequence of his सूत्रs into अध्यायs, and पादs after constantly keeping in view the law of interpretation (परिभाषा) "पूर्वपरनित्यान्तरङ्गापवादानामुत्तरोत्तर बलीय" (परिभाषेन्दुशेखर, परि० ३८), *which is an amplification* of the सूत्र ' विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम् ' (सि कौमुदी, १७५) All this means that if two सूत्रs of equal force come *into conflict with each other, the सूत्र subsequent* (पर) in order *supersedes* the former (पूर्व), a persistent (नित्य) सूत्र supersedes a subsequent (पर) सूत्र, an internal (अन्तरङ्ग) सूत्र supersedes a *persistent सूत्र, and a special* (अपवाद) *सूत्र supersedes* an internal सूत्र In other words नित्य, अन्तरङ्ग and अपवाद rules supersede a पर rule, अन्तरङ्ग and अपवाद rules supersede a नित्य rule, and an अपवाद rule supersedes even an अन्तरङ्ग rule *In short, each succeeding rule* mentioned above possesses greater force than each preceding one in its due order Thus पाणिनि arranges his सूत्रs into अध्यायs and पादs after fully considering where *each or the above kinds of सूत्रs is to be* placed But in the case of special grammatical functions, which do not come within the purview of or are opposed to, the above परिभाषा, he adopts a different plan He makes two main divisions of the whole of the अष्टाध्यायी, which consists of thirty-two sections (पादs) *The first division of seven chapters and* one section or twenty-nine sections is called ' सपाद

सप्ताध्यायी', and the second one of three sections is called 'त्रिपादी', which contains special grammatical functions. The सूत्र at the beginning of the त्रिपादी is 'पूर्वत्रासिद्धम्' (अष्टा. ८।२।१; सि. कौ., १२), which means that what follows this सूत्र up to the end is invalid or non-existent with respect to what precedes it. In other words, with respect to the application of the सूत्रs in the सपादसप्ताध्यायी the सूत्रs in the त्रिपादी are to be considered as invalid or non-existent, and even in the त्रिपादी a latter सूत्र is to be considered as non-existent with respect to all former सूत्रs.* This amounts to saying that even though the सूत्रs in the त्रिपादी are subsequent (पर) to सपादसप्ताध्यायी, they do not annul the previous (पूर्व) grammatical functions contained in the सपादसप्ताध्यायी. Thus the injunction laid down by the सूत्र 'पूर्वत्रासिद्धम्' is quite contrary to the injunction laid down in the above परिभाषा 'पूर्वपरनित्यान्तरङ्गापवादानामुत्तरोत्तरं बलीयः'. This is the broad outline according to which पाणिनि has arranged his सूत्रs in the अष्टाध्यायी.

Of the several devices used by पाणिनि in order to secure brevity of expression his invention of प्रत्याहारs (abbreviations) and अनुबन्धs or इत्s (indicatory letters) helping the formation of the प्रत्याहारs is one He, therefore, with extraordinary originality and skill arranged vowels and consonants in the

---

* सपादसप्ताध्यायी प्रति त्रिपाद्यसिद्धा त्रिपाद्यामपि पूर्वं प्रति परं शास्त्रमसिद्धं स्यात्। —सि. कौमुदी, १२

fourteen माहेश्वरसूत्रs or प्रत्याहारसूत्रs at the beginning of the अष्टाध्यायी in such a scientific order that the प्रत्याहारs formed from them should serve some grammatical function in an abbreviated form It is due to this idea of the प्रत्याहारs that he coins new technical terms like 'अच्' and 'हल्' for vowels and consonants respectively The अनुबन्धs or इत्s (indicatory letters) are useful in many other ways For instance, they are applied to roots, affixes, etc , to denote their conjugation or पद and the injunction or prohibition regarding गुण, वृद्धि, सम्प्रसारण, etc , in the formation of nouns (सुबन्त), verbs (तिङन्त), primary derivatives (कृदन्त) and secondary derivatives (तद्धितान्त) depends wholly on them

Taking into account the nature of the अष्टाध्यायी and the *scheme working in the mind of* पाणिनि later grammarians have *methodically classified* all *his* सूत्रs into *six varieties*, which are indicated in the following verse—

> संज्ञा च परिभाषा च विधिर्नियम एव च ।
> *अतिदेशोऽधिकारश्च षड्विधं सूत्रलक्षणम् ॥*

The six varieties of पाणिनि's सूत्रs are—(1) संज्ञा or definitions (2) परिभाषा or rules of interpretation (3) विधि or injunctions (general rules) (4) नियम or restrictive rules (5) अतिदेश or rules indicating extended application by analogy, and (6) अधिकार or governing rules If *nomenclature* and *classification* are the chief features of *methodology*, it may

be stated that the grammarians too have followed it here.

(1) Out of the above six classes of rules the संज्ञासूत्रs define the technical terms † like वृद्धि, गुण, लोप, उपसर्ग, गति, निपात, टि, घु, etc., and briefly express their comprehensive sense, which ought to be always remembered in the study of grammar. Here the logical method of उद्देश, लक्षण and परीक्षा seems to have been unwittingly followed by पाणिनि, who had his own logic and scientific outlook, though the न्यायसूत्रs of गौतम had yet to come into existence. The संज्ञासूत्रs are helpful in understanding the meanings of technical words contained in the general rules or विधिसूत्रs, and are included in the first chapter of the अष्टाध्यायी.

(2) Secondly, the परिभाषासूत्रs are the general laws which are instrumental in the proper interpretation of the विधिसूत्रs and in the establishment of a consistent relation among them A परिभाषा (परितो भाष्यते इति) comprehensively settles the meaning not only of one सूत्र but also of a group of सूत्रs that possess the common characteristics mentioned in it. For instance, the परिभाषासूत्र 'तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य' (सि. कौ. ४०), which lays down a general law regarding the interpretation of a सूत्र with a word in the locative case, is applicable to the विधिसूत्र 'इको यणचि' (सि. कौ. ४७) containing the word

† See the संज्ञाप्रकरण of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी.

'अच्' in the locative as well as to all the सूत्र that contain words in the locative. Thus the परिभाषाs like 'तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य' (सि. कौ. ४१), 'षष्ठी स्थानेयोगा' (सि. कौ ३८), etc., which are actually given by पाणिनि in the form of सूत्र help us to settle the meanings of many सूत्र with the respective characteristics mentioned in them, and form syntactical unity (एकवाक्यता) with the विधिसूत्र. *Some of those* परिभाषाs have been handed down to us in the form of सूत्र by the predecessors of पाणिनि, and some are found as पाणिनि's सूत्र in the first chapter of the अष्टाध्यायी

The later grammarian, नागेश, *collected in his* परिभाषेन्दुशेखर 133 परिभाषाs, which had not been stated in the अष्टाध्यायी, and giving them a systematic form he classified them into three kinds, viz, वाचनिकी, ज्ञापकसिद्ध and न्यायसिद्ध (i) वाचनिकी परिभाषाs *are those* that can be derived either from the sense of पाणिनि's सूत्र *or are found stated in the* महाभाष्य *of* पतञ्जलि as the सूत्र of older grammarians (ii) ज्ञापकसिद्ध परिभाषाs are those that are suggested by the wording of the सूत्र of पाणिनि, who seems to have known them to be in existence (iii) *Now* न्यायसिद्ध परिभाषाs *are sub-divided into* (a) लौकिकन्यायसिद्ध, which are derived from the ordinary experience of people, and (b) शास्त्रीयन्यायसिद्ध, which are established by logical induction or by the scientific maxims (न्याय) of the मीमांसा. *It must* be noted that *though the* मीमांसासूत्र *of* जैमिनि cannot be definitely said to have existed at the time of

पाणिनि, yet an oral tradition of the sacrificial cult and the rules for its interpretation did exist. पाणिनि might have, therefore, availed himself of that lore in formulating his परिभाषाs, which in later times increased in number and received a methodical form under the direct influence of the मीमांसाशास्त्र.

(3) Thirdly, a विधिसूत्र or a general rule lays down some new injunction which is not previously known by any other means. A विधिसूत्र is principal with reference to the other types of सूत्रs, which are its accessories. For instance, 'इको यणचि' (सि. कौ. ४७), 'एचोऽयवायावः' (सि. कौ. ६१), 'ह्रस्वनद्यापो नुट्' (सि. कौ. २०८) are विधिसूत्रs. निषेधसूत्रs or prohibitive rules may be included under the विधिसूत्रs, as they negatively enjoin something.

(4) Fourthly, a नियमसूत्र is one which restricts the sense of a विधिसूत्र or a general rule. For instance, 'रात्सस्य' (सि. कौ. २८०) is a नियमसूत्र which restricts the sense of the general rule 'संयोगान्तस्य लोपः' (सि. कौ. ५४).

(5) Fifthly, an अतिदेशसूत्र is that which indicates that the character of one thing is to be transferred to another by analogy. For instance, the rule for treating a substitute or आदेश like its former occupant or स्थानी (स्थानिवदादेशः etc., सि. कौ. ४९) is a rule for transference. This classification of सूत्रs into विधि, नियम and अतिदेश again seems to have been made under the direct influence of the methodology of the मीमांसा, which has supplied the व्याकरण with the above three terms.

(6) Lastly, an अधिकारसूत्र (a leading or governing rule) is one which stands at the beginning of a new topic and which, therefore, broadly corresponds to an अधिकरण (a topic) of other Indian systems, inasmuch as it exerts its influence over a number of सूत्रs that follow it, up to the end of a particular topic. Such अधिकारसूत्रs as 'पूर्वत्रासिद्धम्' (सि. कौ. १२), 'प्राग्रीश्वरान्निपाताः (सि. कौ. १९), 'कारके' (सि कौ. ५३४), 'अनभिहिते' (सि. कौ. ५३६), etc., have enabled पाणिनि to avoid unnecessary repetition of words and maintain brevity of expression. In this respect he has employed two devices, viz., अनुवृत्ति and अपकर्ष, which are, of course, to be used according to certain rules. अनुवृत्ति is the process of inserting the necessary words of the अधिकारसूत्र in the following सूत्रs so as to complete their meaning; while अपकर्ष is the anticipation of a word of a later सूत्र in a former सूत्र. When the words of a former सूत्र are inserted in a later सूत्र which comes after the intervention of some other सूत्रs, the process of inserting words is called 'मण्डूकप्लुति' (Skipping or the leap of a frog).

It should not be supposed that पाणिनि's grammatical system is simply a product of his resourceful imagination, divorced from reality. For, he mainly deals with the 'भाषा' (भाष्येऽस्मै) or *spoken* Sanskrit as distinguished from the Vedic Sanskrit, and makes repeated references to the linguistic variations of the Easterners and Northerners. He had, therefore,

the opportunity of resorting to the *direct observation* of the Sanskrit speech as used by people in its synthetic form, and of scientifically framing his सूत्र or generalizations by the *Method of Induction* after the comparison and contrast of particular linguistic facts. His generalizations on the peculiarities of the Vedic Sanskrit are based on the mass of the Vedic literature available to him at that time, and are also reached mainly by the 'inductive method', though it is possible to say that he was acquainted with the generalizations or rules formulated by the former grammarians. The *analytical method* of separating the stem and affix of a word and deriving it from a root is prominently observable in पाणिनि, who must have availed himself of यास्क's *etymological method*. Thus, though he concentrates his attention on the verb as the ultimate element, the Nominal Style of his सूत्र, which can be characterized as the omission of verbs and the significant use of case-relations is in marked contrast with what he teaches

In पाणिनि's system कात्यायन is the next important grammarian, who in his वार्त्तिक has added to what पाणिनि had laid down, and has made up his deficiencies, according to the definition of the term 'वार्त्तिक'*. After him पतञ्जलि is the third original grammarian, who substantially contributed to the system of पाणिनि by explaining, enlarging upon, and defending the सूत्र of the अष्टाध्यायी against कात्यायन

* उक्तानुक्तदुरुक्तचिन्ता वार्त्तिकम् ।

in his महाभाष्य. It can be definitely said that the systems of न्याय, वैशेषिक and मीमांसा had already been established when पतञ्जलि wrote his भाष्य and that he lent a scientific character to the grammatical system by adopting the methodology of those three systems

In the first place, in order to settle and classify the fundamental concepts of grammar पतञ्जलि seems to have accepted almost all the categories of the वैशेषिकs *with the addition of* शक्ति *(power, efficiency)* which lies latent in the eternal relation between a word and its meaning † At the beginning of his भाष्य, while discussing what a word means, he actually mentions the categories, viz, द्रव्य (Substance), गुण (Quality), क्रिया (Action), and सामान्य (Generality), and while telling how words should be taught, he mentions सामान्य (Generality) and विशेष (Particularity)$ though they do not strictly convey the sense of the वैशेषिकs समवाय (Inherence) seems to have been *tacitly acknowledged in the intimate* relation between वाचक (word) and वाच्य (meaning), जाति (Genus) and व्यक्ति (Individual), गुण or विशेषण (quality) and गुणिन् or विशेष्य (the qualified), अवयव (part) and अवयविन् (the whole), etc The other grammatical concepts common to the other systems are सामानाधिकरण्य (the state of having a common substratum) and कार्यकारणसम्बन्ध (causal relation) सामा

† सिद्धे शब्दार्थसम्बन्धे। पा. म. भाष्य, आ. १.

$ किञ्चित्सामान्यविशेषवल्लक्षण प्रवर्त्यम्। पा. म भाष्य, आ. १.

नाधिकरण्य is denoted by words in the same case (विभक्ति) and by the instances of the कर्मधारय compound. द्रव्य, गुण and क्रिया are denoted by nouns, adjectives, and verbs respectively, yet in deciding what a word is, पतञ्जलि says that a word is not merely Substance, or Quality, or Action, or Configuration-Genus (आकृति, जाति) A word like 'गौ', however, is that which, when uttered, gives us the idea of an individual with all these attributes, or a word is the *sound* which *suggests* the idea of a thing in our daily affairs * This definition of the word implies, of course, the theory of the indivisible स्फोट (word-essence), which is postulated by the grammarians, and which is said to be manifested by the sound or word The question whether the meaning of a word is the genus (जाति, आकृति) or an individual (व्यक्ति, द्रव्य) has been solved by पतञ्जलि by saying, on the authority of पाणिनि, that it is both the genus and the individual § It is for this reason that words are held by the grammarians to denote जाति, गुण, क्रिया and द्रव्य (व्यक्ति or सत्ता) Like the मीमांसकs the grammarians too postulate an additional category 'शक्ति' (energy or efficiency), the manifestations of which are held by them to be Space

---

* येनोच्चारितेन सास्नालाङ्गूलककुदखुरविषाणिनां सम्प्रत्ययो भवति स शब्द । अथवा प्रतीतपदार्थको लोके ध्वनि शब्द इत्युच्यते । पा. म. भाष्य, आ. १.

§ किं पुनराकृति. पदार्थ आहोस्विद् द्रव्यम्? उभयमित्याह। कथं ज्ञायते? उभयथा ह्याचार्येण सूत्राणि पठितानि । पा. म भाष्य, आ. १.

(दिक्, देश), Time (काल), Action (क्रिया) and Instrument (साधन). The relation of space, for instance, is denoted by the ablative and locative cases, that of time by different tenses, and that of instrument (साधन) by the instrumental case The concept of 'relation' (सम्बन्ध), which is of many kinds as indicated above, is of much importance in the grammatical science and is generally denoted by the genitive case Action (क्रिया), which is denoted by verbal roots, is also a very important grammatical concept, and it gives rise to the कारक–relations of the agent (कर्ता), the object (कर्म), the instrument (साधन, करण), etc , in a sentence The idea of 'करण', which is the instrumental cause according to the grammarians, is in close conformity with the definition of 'करण' given by the नैयायिकs, as 'a peculiar and operative cause' (व्यापारवदसाधारण कारणम्). The 'करण' or instrumental cause is distinguished by the वैयाकरणs from 'हेतु', which is according to them a cause in general or the material cause Thus the theory of causation which is a distinct feature of the न्याय methodology, finds its due place even in the grammatical system

It is now an established fact that even in the time of पतञ्जलि Sanskrit was a spoken language among the cultured classes (शिष्ट) He could, therefore, expound and verify the generalizations or सूत्रs of पाणिनि and वार्तिकs of कात्यायन in the light of repeated observation, of actual linguistic facts, in other words, he could apply both the inductive and

deductive methods of Logic to his exposition of the grammatical science. In this respect it is interesting to see how he describes his own method of approach to grammar. In the beginning of his भाष्य he quotes the example 'पञ्च पञ्चनखा भक्ष्याः', often used by the मीमांसक in order to explain the rule of exclusion (परिसङ्ख्या),* and comes to the conclusion that it is better for the sake of conciseness to deal with correct words to the exclusion of incorrect ones. He further says that it is not necessary also to undergo the lengthy process of quoting every correct word in language for its grammatical treatment. For, it is possible to teach a vast multitude of words, with the economy of time and labour, by means of *general* and *special* rules, which may be termed 'उत्सर्ग' and 'अपवाद' respectively. First a generalization or उत्सर्ग, which is widely applicable to many particular cases may be stated, and then the special rule or exception (अपवाद) to that generalization may be mentioned.$ Again he quotes a वाचनिकी परिभाषा § and says that if a doubt arises as to the exact meaning of a grammatical generalization, it should be dispelled by the

* भक्ष्यनियमेनाभक्ष्यप्रतिषेधो गम्यते। 'पञ्च पञ्चनखा भक्ष्याः' इत्युक्ते गम्यत एतद्—अतोऽन्येऽभक्ष्या इति। पा. म. भाष्य, आ. १

$ किं पुनरत्र ज्यायः? लघुत्वाच्छब्दोपदेशः। ...किञ्चित्सामान्यविशेषवल्लक्षणं प्रवर्त्यम्। येनाल्पेन यत्नेन महतो महतः शब्दौघान्प्रतिपद्येरन्। ...कश्चिदुत्सर्गः कर्तव्यः, कश्चिदपवादः। सामान्येनोत्सर्गः कर्तव्यः। तस्य विशेषेणापवादः। (पा. म. भा. आ. १). § व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्न हि सन्देहादलक्षणम्। (परि. भा. शेखर, १).

authoritative interpretation of that generalization supplied by the grammarians, and that the grammatical science should not be supposed to be meaningless on account of that doubt Though the eternal relation between a word and its meaning is understood from the actual use of language made by people, and though people use words in language without forming them and without consulting a grammarian for the knowledge of their correct use, yet grammar sets down rules or generalizations for their correct use, which conduces to the religious merit † पतञ्जलि further tells what is meant by 'Interpretation or Explanation' and adds that Explanation does not merely mean the separation of words in a सूत्र as 'वृद्धि-आत्-ऐच्', but it includes collectively the citation of examples and counter-examples, and addition of words required for completing the meaning All this has to be done in the case of a beginner * This scientific method of explaining the सूत्रs or of starting from a generalization to an example is followed by पतञ्जलि everywhere in his भाष्य In addition to this it is instructive to quote in this context a concrete

† लोकेऽर्थमर्थमुपादाय शब्दान्प्रयुञ्जते, नैषां निर्वृत्तौ यत्न कुर्वन्ति। न तद्वच्छब्दान्प्रयुयुक्षमाणो वैयाकरणकुल गत्वाह कुरु शब्दान् प्रयोक्ष्य इति। लोकतोऽर्थप्रयुक्ते शब्दप्रयोगे शास्त्रेण धर्मनियम क्रियते। (पा म भा आ १)

* न केवलानि चर्चापदानि व्याख्यानम्–'वृद्धि आत् ऐच्' इति। किं तर्हि ? उदाहरण प्रत्युदाहरण वाक्याध्याहार इत्येतत्समुदित व्याख्यान भवति। अविजानत एतदेव भवति। पा. म भा आ. १.

illustration of his *etymological and dialectic method of explaining* a Vedic verse. It is as follows-

"सक्तुमिव तितउना पुनन्तो यत्र धीरा मनसा वाचमक्रत।
अत्रा सखायः सख्यानि जानते भद्रैषां लक्ष्मीर्निहिताधि वाचि॥

सक्तुः—सचतेर्दुर्धावो भवति, कसतेर्वा विपरीताद्विकसितो भवति। तितउ परिपवनं भवति—ततवद्वा तुन्नवद्वा। धीरा ध्यानवन्तः। मनसा प्रज्ञानेन। वाचमक्रत वाचमकृषत। अत्रा सखायः सख्यानि जानते। अत्र सखायः सन्तः सख्यानि जानते। सायुज्यानि जानते। क्व? य एष दुर्गो मार्गः, एकगम्यो वाग्विषयः। के पुनस्ते? वैयाकरणाः। कुत एतत्? 'भद्रैषां लक्ष्मीर्निहिताधि वाचि'। एषां वाचि भद्रा लक्ष्मीर्निहिता भवति। लक्ष्मीर्लक्षणाद्भासनात्परिवृढा भवति॥" —पा. म. भा. आ. १

Particularly, this Dialectic Method of explanation has been followed by पतञ्जलि throughout the whole of his महाभाष्य, and it has assumed, in the later commentary literature, *the definite form of* 'खण्डान्वय', which will be dealt with in detail later on.

It will be clear from what has been said above that पतञ्जलि is in favour of the *deductive method of teaching grammar,* inasmuch as he finds that the process of starting from a generlization to an example is the most economical way of dealing with that subject. Yet he recognizes the truth that people learn language by actual usage, and that grammar simply helps them to correct and organize their speech. Of course, he is quite conscious of the fact that the generalizations or rules of grammar are based on the language already in use, and that those generalizations are arrived at *inductively* by grammarians from the particular examples

the sounds 'पच्' and 'अति' are heard, and the meanings invariably associated with them are understood by us. In other words, *'the action of cooking'* is associated with the stem 'पच्' and *'the agency and oneness'* (कर्तृत्वमेकत्व च) are *associated* with the affix 'अति'. If again the word 'पठति' (He reads) is uttered, the sound 'पच्' vanishes (हीयते), the sound 'पठ्' is added (उपजायते), and the sound 'अति' remains common (अन्वयी). *In association with this, the meaning 'action of cooking'* of the stem 'पच्' vanishes, the meaning '*action of reading' of the stem 'पठ्' is added, and the meaning* 'agency and oneness' of the affix 'अति' remains common It can, therefore, be decided that the meaning of a particular word (e g पच्) is that which disappears with the disappearance of its sound, that the meaning of a word (e g पठ्) is that which is added with the addition of its sound, and that the meaning of that which is common (e g अति) is that, the sound of which is common

Thus the *repeated observation of the presence and absence of a sound* in its invariable association with the *presence and absence of an idea* (action, individual or thing) leads us to analyse a word into प्रकृति and प्रत्यय, to find out their *agreement and difference* (अन्वयव्यतिरेक), and to determine their respective meanings The same *analytical process* (पदसंस्कार) of the observation of agreement and difference can be adopted in the case of all the

possible forms of a collection of similar words For instance all the case-forms (बालः, बालम्, बालेन, बालाय, बालात्, etc) of the same प्रातिपदिक (e g बाल) or all the verbal forms (e g पठति, पठतः, पठन्ति etc) of the same root (e g पठ्) in a particular tense or mood can be collected, so as to distinguish their similar elements (प्रकृति) like 'बाल' and 'पठ्' from dissimilar elements like the प्रत्ययs Really speaking, the meaning of a word can be better understood when both the प्रकृति and प्रत्यय are combined in their synthetic or natural form in language, yet the *analytical method* of grammar helps us to enter into the heart of the individual meaning of a word, and to use it correctly

Of course, this analytical method of agreement and difference is so far followed with the assumption that each sound or word represents only one idea But how can this method be applied to synonyms like 'इन्द्र, शक्र, पुरुहूत, पुरन्दर' etc, and to homonyms like 'अक्षा, पाद, माषा' etc? पतञ्जलि answers that here too the meanings are determined by the same method For, it is found by the repeated observation of the presence and absence of sounds or words that the synonyms of a particular word as well as the different meanings denoted by a homonym are limited in number, and that a limited number of sounds is invariably associated with a limited number of meanings It is, therefore, possible to apply the method of 'अन्वयव्यतिरेक' in such cases and also to determine the distinct meanings of प्रकृति and प्रत्यय

This *scientific method* of the repeated observation of अन्वय and व्यतिरेक in the grammatical forms of words as described in detail by पतञ्जलि is the *inductive method* This is the *grammarian's own approach* to particular linguistic facts so as to arrive at the grammatical generalizations or rules *The same concrete process should be adopted in teaching grammar to young pupils In other words, the pupils are to be placed first in the position of investigators into the similarity or difference of the particular forms of words, and then led through their repeated observation to arrive at a generalization as the last step* This method is, *of course*, to be adopted up to a certain stage of the understanding of pupils, *when the concrete approach to grammar is calculated to prove more beneficial to them* Moreover, *it should be noted that the field of the observation of linguistic facts in the case of pupils is far more limited than that in the case of a grammarian who has to traverse a vast area* The inductive method can, *therefore*, be followed in the case of pupils in a far more economical way, *though this procedure would not be thoroughly scientific*, as the generalization would be reached after the observation of *a few linguistic facts* Another linguistic principle to be noted in the भाष्य of पतञ्जलि is that there is the *intimate relation or invariable association between a sound (word) and its meaning* This psychological fact observed by him shows how a *direct bond* between a word and an idea is formed in our minds, and *it gives a*

hint of the Direct Method of teaching sounds or words in association with concrete objects. In short, पतञ्जलि has presented a scientific aspect to the analysis of words (पदसंस्कार) in grammar, by adopting the principles of general methodology propounded by Logic.

After पतञ्जलि's महाभाष्य the two important grammatical works worthy of being taken into account are the वाक्यपदीय of भर्तृहरि and the काशिकावृत्ति of the joint authors जयादित्य and वामन who were Buddhists. The वाक्यपदीय principally deals with the philosophical aspect of grammar and expounds in detail the theory of स्फोट (word-essence). The grammarians, who are स्फोटवादिन्s and hence वाक्यवादिन्s, say that the स्फोट is an indivisible whole containing all meanings, that it is manifested by the sounds of words, and that the 'वाक्यस्फोट' is the principal one. They, therefore, add that a sentence is the unit of language, and that the analytical method of separating the प्रकृति and प्रत्यय of a word (पद) is an imaginary and artificial process adopted solely for the purpose of facilitating the understanding of beginners.*

Now the काशिकावृत्ति is, perhaps, the best commentary on the अष्टाध्यायी, and it lucidly explains every सूत्र with many examples, chiefly following the order of सूत्रs adopted by पाणिनि. It appears that the

* उपायाः शिक्षमाणानां बालानामुपलालनाः ।
असत्ये वर्त्मनि स्थित्वा ततः सत्यं समीहते ॥–वाक्यपदीयम्, २।२४०

study of the Paninian system was popular with the the Buddhists, of whom the authors of the काशिका and जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि $ have contributed much to the system of पाणिनि. It is interesting and instructive to know what I-tsing, the Chinese pilgrim of the 7th century (671-695 A. D.), says about the ancient grammarians in पाणिनि's system, the ancient methods of studying it and the period required for finishing the study of each work. With reference to the prominent position held by Grammar in the curriculum of the 7th century A. D., I-tsing says, "I trust that now a thorough study of Sanskrit grammar may clear up many difficulties we encounter whilst engaged in translation." He then refers to the अष्टाध्यायी of पाणिनि and further says, "Children begin to learn the सूत्र when they are eight years old and can repeat it in eight months' time." Then incidentally mentioning 'The Book on धातु' (धातुपाठ) he tells that the pupils studied afterwards 'The Book on the Three Khilas.' It is said to contain three parts, viz, अष्टधातु, मण्ड or मुण्ड (माण्डूकी शिक्षा ?) and उणादि. The अष्टधातु is said to deal with सुबन्त and तिङन्त or the declension of nouns and conjugation of verbs,† the मण्ड or मुंण्ड (?) treated of "the formation of words by means of combining a root

$ He is also called 'श्रीबोधिसत्त्वदेशीयाचार्य', and is the author of the न्यास,- a detailed commentary on the काशिका.

† Was this अष्टधातु like our 'शब्दरूपावलि' and 'धातुरूपावलि' containing ready-made forms of words?

and a suffix or suffixes"; and the उणादि contained "a class of primary suffixes beginning with उ." After this he says," Boys begin to learn the book on the three Khilas (or 'three pieces of waste land') when they are *ten years old,* and understand them thoroughly after *three years'* diligent study " Regarding the exact nature of the three खिलs nothing more than this can be said, since except the उणादि they do not seem to exist to-day. The work studied afterwards by ancient pupils is the काशिका which is styled 'The Vritti-sutra' by him and about which he says, "Boys of *fifteen* begin to study this commentary, and understand it after *five years* If men of China go to India for study, they have first of all to learn this (grammatical) work, then other subjects; if not, their labour will be thrown away. All these books should be learnt by heart But this, as a rule, applies only to men of high talent, while for those of medium, or little ability a different measure (method) must be taken according to their wishes They should study hard day and night, without letting a moment pass for idle repose ... After having studied this commentary, students begin to learn composition in prose and verse, and devote themselves to logic (हेतुविद्या) and metaphysic (अभिधर्मकोश) In learning the न्यायद्वारतारकशास्त्र they rightly draw inferences (अनुमान), and by studying the जातकमाला* their powers of

* Here he refers to the Sanskrit text of आर्यशूर's जातकमाला which is written in a beautiful Sanskrit style.

comprehension increase. Thus instructed by their teachers and instructing others they pass two or three years, generally in the Nalanda monastery' † I tsing then alludes to पतञ्जलि's महाभाष्य, which is called 'चूर्णि' by him, and which was studied at the last *stage of the grammatical course* About it he remarks, "Advanced scholars learn this in *three years* ' He then gives detailed information about the personality and works of भर्तृहरि

The conclusions to be deduced from the above extracts are that in order to attain a thorough mastery of Sanskrit the study of grammar was considered to be the most important means and if the whole period mentioned for finishing the full course in it up to the study of पतञ्जलि's महाभाष्य be taken into consideration it comprises about twelve years *testifying to the adage* 'द्वादशभिर्वर्षैर्व्याकरण श्रूयते' (पञ्चतन्त्र) Another note worthy fact is that even though the grammar of पाणिनि has been held to be a वेदाङ्ग, it was found to be an indispensable subject of study by the non-Vedic Buddhists also and this fact proves the non-sectarian character of its major portion which is devoted to the Classical Sanskrit The *third thing to be noted is that the study of* grammar was *first begun and continued* at least for nine years up to the complete study of the काशिका, after which the attention of students was drawn to the reading of literature like the

† *A Record of the Buddh st Religion by I tsing translated by J Takakusu*

जातकमाला, to composition in prose and verse, and to the study of other शास्त्र like logic and metaphysics. It is not definitely known what sort of literature (prose and poetry) other than the जातकमाला was read by students It is highly probable that the बुद्धचरित of अश्वघोष and some other literary works were read along with the जातकमाला Yet the study of grammar for nine continuous years without anything of literature was, doubtless, unduly long and tedious It may be said here that Sanskrit was perhaps used in speech and writing by cultured people at that time, that it was a far more living language to the people of that period than it is at present, and that being in closer touch with it the anicent students could perseveringly pursue their grammatical studies in the light of concrete examples of the living language Granting all these suppositions it ought to be said that the incessant pursuit of grammar for so long a period might certainly have been irksome to students To add to this tedium everything had to be learnt by heart Although learning by heart has its own merits which I-tsing has acknowledged elsewhere, * it may be suggested in agreement with him that there is some room for improvement in such a method, and that distinction between intelligent and ordinary students should be observed in this respect I-tsing, perhaps, means that learning by heart should be limited

* I-tsing s passage about the importance of memorization has been quoted by us in the chapter on 'Syllabus in Sanskrit,' (Section II).

only to important things like the पाणिनीयसूत्र, and that the period of studying grammar should be shortened so as to allow more time for the reading of literature.

It must be remembered that the काशिकावृत्ति is written strictly in the order in which पाणिनि has written his अष्टाध्यायी, which is wanting in a proper topical arrangement The result of this was that unless the whole of the काशिका was studied for five years it was not possible for ancient students to know the grammatical formation of words Had the अष्टाध्यायी been taught according to some topical arrangement, its study might have been simplified and prosecuted in a less number of years *It was necessary to adopt that arrangement of grammatical topics which would correspond to the change in the genius of Sanskrit from the Verbal to the Nominal Style It is, therefore, advisable to mark the stages of growth which Sanskrit language has gradually undergone, and the chief characteristics which it has assumed once for all*

Since the Vedic times Sanskrit has been the language of the religion science and culture of the Hindus It is now our language of sacraments and it has been definitely proved by scholars that it was used in speech and writing by the cultured classes up to the beginning of the Mohammedan period. In the fourth and fifth centuries A D, it was the court language of the गुप्तs, as is evidenced by the Sanskrit inscriptions of that period, and even the Buddhists and the Jains, despite the commands of

the founders of their religions to use only प्राकृत, adopted the suitable medium of Sanskrit in later times for the propagation of their faiths, and substantially contributed to Sanskrit grammar and literature *Yuan Chwang* (629-645 A. D), the Chinese pilgrim, tells that Sanskrit was used by the Hindus and the Buddhists of the 7th century A. D, in debates, public and private. He says, "In language, speaking generally, they have not varied from the original source, but the people of 'Mid-India' are pre eminently explicit and correct in speech, their expressions being harmonious and elegant, like those of the *devas*, and their intonation clear and distinct, serving as a rule and pattern for others.' $ He also mentions the fact that the language was undergoing deterioration along the border lands of India, yet it can clearly be seen that Sanskrit was being spoken, more correctly of course by cultured people, in his time. Side by side with this the ceaseless literary activity of the most distinguished and learned poets and philosophers continued in producing the best literature in Sanskrit at least up to the end of the 12th century A. D.

Now the gradual and continuous transition of Sanskrit *from the Verbal to the Nominal Style* may be described The most ancient Vedic Sanskrit assumed a new form in the ब्राह्मणs and उप-निषद्s which chiefly represented the Verbal Style. In the Brahmanic Sanskrit the antiquated forms of

$ Yuan Chwang's Travels in India, by Thomas Watters.

Vedic words are eliminated, the declension of nouns being regularized approaches that of the Classical Sanskrit, verbal *roots are* classified according to conjugations, though the distinction between the परस्मैपद and आत्मनेपद is not strictly observed, and the indeclinable participles ending in 'त्वा' and 'तुम्' are being regularly used In it verbal *forms* (*finite* verbs) in all tenses and moods are abundantly found, and the correct use of the past tenses, viz , the Perfect and the Aorist, is made The sentences are short, simple and not involved or *complex* If the *relative clauses* are *used, they* are *easy* and *very few* The *language* of the उपनिषद्s shows almost the same traits, yet it contains less archaic forms than the ब्राह्मणs and *comes nearer* to the Classical Sanskrit

The सूत्र-works which followed the उपनिषद्s show a marked change from the Verbal to the Nominal Style, a few features of which have been indicated in the *context* of सूत्र-*works*. पाणिनि's सूत्रs are, of course, not an exception to the general tendency of the सूत्र-works, and strangely enough, adopt the Nominal Style simply for the sake of brevity, though they deal with verbs at a great length. Although पाणिनि *treats of the Sanskrit language of the* literature that preceded him, yet he mainly treats of the spoken form (भाषा) of Sanskrit in his time Thus the norm laid down by पाणिनि in his grammar brought, as it were, *into being the Classical Sanskrit* and exerted a permanent influence upon the *later* Classical

Literature, which was, on the whole, prominently Nominal in style. This style can be traced back at least to 300 B. C., when कौटिल्य wrote his अर्थशास्त्र. *The main features of that Nominal Style* are as follows—

(1) In the Nominal Style more stress is laid on the case-relations of nouns and noun-equivalents (adjectives, nominal derivatives and verbal derivatives) as expressive of various senses like कर्ता, कर्म, करण, etc , than on the finite verb, which occupies an insignificant position in a Sanskrit sentence. Many times the genitive, as a general case (शेषे षष्ठी), expresses the senses of other cases. The genitive and locative absolutes, which express special relations of a subordinate clause with the principal clause, are peculiar to Sanskrit.

(2) Compounds are employed in a more or less degree in the Classical Literature giving rise to the four styles of Sanskrit composition, viz., वैदर्भी, गौडी, पाञ्चाली and लाटी. Compounds are doubtless useful for securing brevity of expression; yet some later writers use lengthy compounds so profusely that they make their language perplexing, cumbrous and artificial. The बहुव्रीहि compound, which compresses a whole sentence into an adjectival phrase and which adds grace to the language, is a speciality of the Nominal Style. The अव्ययीभाव compound is another speciality which brings together more words than one into an adverbial phrase.

(3) The verbal forms of the root भू and अस् (to be) are many times idiomatically dropped, and the

function of these two is performed by nouns and adjectives, *which are their compliments, and which are, therefore, used predicatively* Sometimes a *verb like* 'पचति' *is split into two parts, one signifying* the special action by means of a noun or adjective like 'पाक' or 'पक्व', and another denoting the general action by means of verbs like 'करोति' or 'भवति' This tendency is generally found among the मीमासकs, who split verbs like 'यजेत' into 'यागेन भावयेत्–कुर्यात्'. *Sometimes the verb is altogether dropped by using* nominal expressions like 'वेदपाठक' for 'वेद पाठयति' Thus nominal derivatives and participles are many times employed for finite verbs Again the passive form of a verb or a participle is of more occurrence than the active one All these devices are used perhaps for simplifying 'Expression' through the non-observance of distinctions in the conjugational system and have caused many roots in the धातुपाठ to fall into disuse The tendency of avoiding *difficult verbal forms by means of the above devices is found in the* पञ्चतन्त्र and *the* हितोपदेश, *which are* specially meant for beginners in Sanskrit The verbs in the present tense are generally used in the speeches of characters in dramas and stories in the statements of general truths and in the descriptive and reflective compositions yet the passive forms of the present tense are mostly preferred to the active ones The finite verb in the present tense is many times eliminated by using the present participle adjectively or predicatively,

in order to join clauses and maintain the balance and continuity of a sentence The historic and habitual present tenses are found generally in the पञ्चतन्त्र and similar works The future tense is less frequent than the present and the Second Future is more common than the First Future The adjectival use of future participles is also made for joining clauses and maintaining balance in a sentence. The past tense is mostly employed in narration, and the use of the Imperfect, Perfect and Aorist with their special functions is made more or less correctly by authors Some authors do not seem to observe any distinction among those three tenses while some without employing the actual forms of the past tense indicate it simply by using 'स्म' with verbs in the present tense The more common way of denoting the past tense is that of using the past passive participles and past active participles, which do the work of noun-equivalents, of qualitative and predicative adjectives, or of finite verbs themselves The past passive participles of transitive as well as intransitive verbs are however, more frequent than the past active participles, and hence the authors usually adopt passive and impersonal constructions in their writings Similarly, potential passive participles are frequently used for verbs in the potential mood, and the sentence in which they are employed naturally becomes passive in construction This general partiality for past participles shows the indifference of the authors to the specific functions of the above three kinds of the past tense

(4) *Syntax*—Passive and impersonal constructions, as referred to above, are frequent in sentences. Later authors exhibit much fondness for periphrasis, alliterations, lengthy compounds, *double entendre*, and complicated or unwieldy sentences. An affirmative sentence is sometimes turned into that with a double negative. The Sanskrit sentence affords much scope for flexibility of expression on account of freedom in the order of words given by the inflexional nature of the language The order of words, however, is not wholly arbitrary, since in sentences language-units (words, etc.) are used according to the natural sequence of thought. In a prose sentece, therefore, the subject with its attributive adjuncts comes first, then the object, if any, with its attributive adjuncts, and the verb or predicate with its adverbial adjuncts comes last. But adverbs and adverbial expressions never come at the end of a sentence The words which are governed precede those by which they are governed; and hence a qualitative adjective precedes its substantive, but predicative adjectives come after the subject Words in the genitive and those in apposition generally precede a noun to which they are related Vocatives, interrogatives and exclamatory words come at the beginning of a sentence The predicate generally follows the subject, yet this order is sometimes reversed for the sake of emphasis Conjunctions are generally used at the beginning of clauses, yet those like च, वा, तु, हि, चेत्, etc., never occur at the begin-

ning. Relative words like यथा, यावत्, यद्, यतः, etc., are used at the beginning of subordinate clauses and their correlatives like तथा, तावत्, तद्, ततः, etc., stand before the principal clause. But as in English the subordinate clauses sometimes follow the principal clause, the order of relative and correlative words being correspondingly reversed. Sometimes the relative words stand between two clauses in such a way that their correlatives are naturally dropped. Absolute constructions mostly precede the principal clause, and absolutives or infinitives coming at the end of subordinate clauses precede the finite verb in the principal clause. The same holds good in the case of gerunds in 'अम्' (णमुल्) which sometimes compress a clause into a small phrase. Later writers employ unduly long sentences which generally contain a single subject, a single object if any, and a single finite verb; but a single noun in them is related to a succession of lengthy expressions in apposition, or to a series of adjectival phrases composed of long compounds, or to a row of relative clauses, short words being interspersed here and there in them to mark pauses. Thus it is found that the major portion of a sentence in the Classical Sanskrit mostly consists of nominal forms (nouns, adjectives, participles, अव्ययs, etc.), and a single finite verb in it is postponed to its end.

(5) The style common to all the शास्त्रs in the later period is nominal in the extreme, since sentences in it represent, in addition to the above-

mentioned characteristics, the absence of verbs and abundance of abstract nouns compounded into lengthy expressions in the nominative and ablative cases Even the participles and the subtle senses of case-relations are ignored by forming lengthy compounds with the set words 'प्रतियोगिन्', 'अवच्छेदक' etc Another tendency observable in the style of the शास्त्र is that of giving every now and then etymological senses, which are sometimes fanciful This style, which has been brought into being by the later नैयायिक, is degenerate indeed, though it is useful for showing preciseness in scientific concepts; but it has generally been adopted by other शास्त्रs, as they have come under the direct influence of the न्याय system As formerly indicated, there are three types of this nominal style of the शास्त्र The first, i e, the *dialogue type,* which is essentially nominal yet simple, chaste and lively, is represented by the भाष्य of पतञ्जलि, वात्स्यायन and शबर, the second or the *lecture type* is represented by the शाङ्करभाष्य, which, though it is nominal in style, is yet fluent and free from any kind of artificiality, and the third or the most artificial type is represented by later works on different शास्त्रs.

What has been detailed above may be aptly summed up in the words of Dr Bhandarkar who says as follows-'The real classical Sanskrit is the Sanskrit of the Epics, the Puranas, the metrical law-books, the better or earlier specimens of Kavyas or poems and dramatic plays, and of the early philosophical

or exegetical works And if we examine this literature we shall find that the greater use of attributive or nominal forms of expression gradually drove out a large portion of the Sanskrit verb, and gave a new character to the language, which may be thus described —Very few verbal forms are used besides those of such tenses as the Present and Future, participles are frequently met with, the verbal forms of some roots, especially of those belonging to the less comprehensive classes, have gone out of use, and in their place we often have a noun expressive of the special action and a verb expressive of action generally; compound words are somewhat freely employed, and a good many of the Taddhita forms or nominal derivatives have disappeared, and in their stead we have periphrastic expressions *If the treatises of Panini and others had perished, and we had to construct a grammar of the Sanskrit from the classical literature I have above indicated, our Verb and the Taddhita portion would be very meagre* "†

The first grammarian, who took into account the predominance of the Nominal Style in Sanskrit and changed accordingly the order of grammatical topics to be taught to beginners, was शर्ववर्मन् (1st century A. D), the founder of the कातन्त्र system, otherwise called the कलाप or कौमारव्याकरण, the origin of which was ascribed to कुमारकार्तिकेय, the son of शिव. He realized the fact that पाणिनि's system, in the absence of any topical arrangement, was studied only by the

† Wilson Philological Lectures, (1914), P 24.

sequence of grammatical topics, and this is the reason why the कातन्त्र is even now studied in Bengal. The अग्निपुराण$ epitomizes the whole of Sanskrit grammar in eleven chapters of 239 verses (अग्निपुराण, अ. ३४९–३५९), and states that the tradition of this grammar has been handed down from स्कन्द or कुमारकार्तिकेय. This, perhaps, means that the chapters in the अग्निपुराण are an epitome of the कातन्त्र, and hence it is natural that the order of grammatical topics in the former is almost the same as that in the latter Those chapters are, therefore, calculated to serve the valuable purpose of settling the most essential grammatical portions to be studied by ordinary students.

It is found after careful examination and comparison that the later grammatical works like the शाकटायनव्याकरण of जैनशाकटायन (9th century A. D.), the सिद्धहेमशब्दानुशासन of हेमचन्द्र (11th century A D.), the सारस्वत (13th century A. D), the मुग्धबोध of बोपदेव (13th century A. D.), the रूपमाला of विमलसरस्वती (14th century A D), the प्रक्रियाकौमुदी of रामचन्द्र (15th century A. D), and the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी of भट्टोजी दीक्षित (17th century A. D) have more or less followed the same order of grammatical topics as in the कातन्त्र † It is not

$ Its date according to MM P V. Kane is about the 8th century A D See his Introduction to the साहित्यदर्पण.

† See Dr Belvalkar s 'Systems of Sanskrit Grammar.' We have, moreover, consulted several original works of those systems and other grammatical manuals, both in the printed and manuscript form, in order to ascertain the natural order of topics and to arrive at the above conclusions.

definitely known how far they were influenced by the कातन्त्र If it is supposed that some of them have independently discoverd the natural arrangement of topics, it means that they have consciously or unconsciously tended to the same natural order in accordance with the prominently Nominal character of Classical Sanskrit and this fact doubtless yields a linguistic principle that *the Nominal part of Sanskrit grammar must be taught to pupils before the Verbal part*

Almost all the above grammarians except विमलसरस्वती, रामचन्द्र, and भट्टोजी दीक्षित have dropped the परिभाषाs and the वैदिकप्रक्रिया Of all the grammatical works prior to the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी of भट्टोजी, the कातन्त्र and the सारस्वत seem to have been the most popular, since they are non-sectarian and treat of important topics in an easy, brief and graded manner It is likely that भट्टोजी should have availed himself of all the attempts of his predecessors in the execution of the perfect and natural arrangement of grammatical topics in his सिद्धान्तकौमुदी Yet it is almost certain that he owes more to the रूपमाला of विमलसरस्वती and the प्रक्रियाकौमुदी of रामचन्द्र than to others in this respect, inasmuch as they are the works belonging to पाणिनि's system, and have more or less done justice to the वैदिकप्रक्रिया The तद्धित, समास and वैदिक sections, however, are not properly placed in the रूपमाला, which gives the first two at the end and the वैदिक section in the middle भट्टोजी has made a decided improvement on the रूपमाला in this respect The

order of topics in the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी is broadly as follows—

I— १ सञ्ज्ञा, २ परिभाषा, ३ सन्धि, ४ सुबन्त, ५ अव्यय, ६ स्त्रीप्रत्यय, ७ कारक, ८ समास, ९ तद्धित, १० द्विरुक्त.

II— ११ तिङन्त, १२ पूर्वकृदन्त, १३ उणादि, १४ उत्तरकृदन्त, १५ वैदिकप्रक्रिया, १६ स्वरप्रकरण, १७ लिङ्गानुशासन.

The credit, therefore, of bringing all the topics connected with the nominal part in the first volume of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, of dealing with the verbal part in its second volume, of doing proper justice to the वैदिकप्रक्रिया at the end, and of popularizing the system of पाणिनि in a new and perfect form certainly goes to भट्टोजी. Thus in the evolution of the arrangement of grammatical topics corresponding to the growth of Sanskrit from the Verbal to the Nominal style the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी represents perhaps the last stage, and is an epoch-making work from the view-point of the re-establishment of पाणिनि's system

After भट्टोजी had written the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, his disciple वरदराज, who was saturated with पाणिनि's system, and who knew very well the relative importance of every सूत्र from the view-point of average students, popularized that system more than those of the कातन्त्र and the सारस्वत. He successively issued with untiring energy his three epitomes of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, viz, the मध्यसिद्धान्तकौमुदी, the लघुसिद्धान्तकौमुदी and the सारसिद्धान्तकौमुदी. † Out of about 4000 सूत्रs of पाणिनि the मध्यकौमुदी contains 2315 सूत्रs, the लघुकौमुदी

† This is still in a manuscript form.

1380 सूत्र and the सारकौमुदी 700 सूत्र All those epitomes indicate the gradual process of reducing the most important grammatical portions to their minimum The सारसिद्धान्तकौमुदी, which is not yet printed, will render valuable assistance to those who want to ascertain the most essential topics of grammar to be studied by average pupils As regards the arrangement of topics the noteworthy feature of all those epitomes is that they *alternately deal with the nominal part and the verbal part* of Sanskrit The general order of topics in them is as follows—

१ संज्ञा, २ सन्धि, ३ सुबन्त, ४ अव्यय, ५ तिङन्त, ६ कृदन्त, ७ विभक्त्यर्थ (कारक), ८ समास, ९ तद्धित, १० स्त्रीप्रत्यय.

In this arrangement वरदराज has devoted to the teaching of verb formation (तिङन्त) 596 सूत्र in the मध्यकौमुदी, 486 सूत्र in the लघुकौमुदी, and 192 सूत्र in the सारकौमुदी He, perhaps, thought that unless the pupils would broadly understand the formation of verbs, they would not realize the propriety of the participles (कृदन्त) often used in literature. Thus he thought that the alternate teaching of the nominal part and the verbal part would be beneficial to students, and hence he changed the order of topics in the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी. It should be admitted that there is some truth in the view that nouns and noun-equivalents should be taught side by side with verbs and verbal derivatives so as to give some idea of the Sanskrit sentence Yet under the present circumstances when Sanskrit is becoming an unpopular

subject, *it is expedient to limit the formation of verbs to the First Group of Conjugations only* The reasons for this will be stated in a separate chapter $

स्वामी दयानन्दसरस्वती too has recast almost the whole of the अष्टाध्यायी with the addition of 112 परिभाषाs and important sentences from the महाभाष्य of पतञ्जलि. He has put together all this matter in his वेदाङ्गप्रकाश (1882 A D.), which follows almost the same order of grammatical topics as in the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, and which seeks to explain the सूत्रs clearly in *Hindi*. On account of the importance he attaches to the Vedic lore he deprecates the कातन्त्र, the सारस्वत, the चन्द्रिका, the मुग्धबोध and the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, which, he says, either do not at all deal with the वैदिकप्रक्रिया, or give a secondary place to it When he himself follows the order of topics in the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, it is unaccountable why he should denounce even that monumental work. He asserts that the whole of Sanskrit grammar can be mastered in *three years*, while the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी and other grammatical works like the शेखर, the मनोरमा, etc., make the subject more difficult He, however, shows much respect for पतञ्जलि's महाभाष्य, the study of which is recommended by him. He has expressed the same views in his सत्यार्थप्रकाश (तृतीयसमुल्लास), and has demonstrated there in detail the method of teaching grammar. He says that the शिक्षा of पाणिनि should be first taught to pupils with special instructions in pronunciation. Then the

$ See 'Syllabus in Sanskrit', Section II.

pupils may be made to learn by heart the अष्टाध्यायी, and afterwards all the सूत्र may be clearly explained. Here † he gives in detail the same method of explaining the सूत्र as he has followed in the वेदाङ्गप्रकाश. He further says that after a clear and detailed explanation of the अष्टाध्यायी is given, it should again be revised, and then the महाभाष्य should be taught. Again, he asserts that if both the teacher and the taught are intelligent, hardworking and persevering, the अष्टाध्यायी can be finished in one year and a half, and further the महाभाष्य within the same period. Thus according to him a student can attain proficiency in grammar in *three years*, and can properly and profitably devote the remaining time to the study of other शास्त्र. He prefers the 'आर्ष' method (used by the great sages like पाणिनि and पतञ्जलि) of teaching grammar to that followed by the कातन्त्र, the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, etc., as the former, he says, is economical from the standpoint of time and labour, and as the latter is made purposely difficult and artificial (!). It is, however, strange that though he underrates the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, he generally follows its arrangement of grammatical topics in his वेदाङ्गप्रकाश ! दयानन्दसरस्वती was, doubtless, a great Sanskrit scholar who tried his utmost for the revival of Sanskrit learning. His thoughts on the teaching of Sanskrit are, therefore, worthy of consideration and trial.

† See the 'सत्यार्थप्रकाश', तृतीयसमुल्लास.

A new attempt of organizing the सूत्र of पाणिनि, in such a way that the organization would serve as a good introduction to the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, has been made by Pt गङ्गासहाय of Bundi, whose सुगमकौमुदी has been published by the Venkateshwar Press in 1902 A D He finds that even the लघुकौमुदी contains some matter not required by beginners, and that some information usually required by them is not included in it He, therefore, has divided the सूत्र of पाणिनि into two chapters' of two sections each, and has arranged them according to the *Concentric Method* By the ' concentric method ' a subject *as a whole* is first taught *in a broad outline* and then more and more details of the same are gradually introduced, so as to suit the capacities of beginners The concentric method is thoroughly scientific or psychological according to the modern technique of teaching, and is calculated to be much beneficial particularly to novices, if it is followed in the teaching of पाणिनि's grammar The author of the सुगमकौमुदी, for instance, has given in the first section of about 745 सूत्र the broad outline of the whole of Sanskrit grammar, has introduced in it all the most important portions required by an ordinary student for reading literature, and has followed the same order of topics as adopted in the epitomes of वरदराज He has further introduced more and more details of the same topics in the same order in the remaining three sections of the book This method as adopted by the author is worthy

of being actually practised and merits wider circulation

Side by side with the tendency of epitomizing पाणिनि's अष्टाध्यायी another tendency of teaching *the ready-made forms of nouns and verbs* is visible in the introduction of grammar The latter tendency seems to have long preceded the former, if the 'अट्ठधातु' of the Buddhists, as previously referred to, might have been similar to our शब्दरूपावलि and धातुरूपावलि It should be remembered that the need of books like the शब्दरूपावलि and the धातुरूपावलि is not felt when a language is current or spoken,

and verbs through the शब्दरूपावलि and the धातुरूपावलि is current among us at least for the last 500 years § The same tendency of dealing with the important topics like कारक, समास, तद्धित, तिङ्, कृत्, etc., after presupposing the knowledge of ready-made forms, is observable in manuals like the प्रबोधचन्द्रिका of वैजलभूपति (18 th century A D) † and the सज्जनेन्द्रप्रयोगकल्पद्रुम of धर्माधिकारिकृष्णपण्डित (19 th century A D) $ It is worthy of note that all such manuals stress the necessity of teaching 'कारक' first of all in Sanskrit grammar.*

A third tendency noticeable in grammar teaching is the unification of language (लक्ष्य) and grammar (लक्षण). It has formerly been suggested how the teaching of generalizations or rules in grammar becomes abstract and tedious without concrete examples from language and literature It is,

---

§ It may incidentally be mentioned here that the B. O. R. Institute MSS Library of Poona possesses a manuscript of the शब्दरूपावलि belonging to संवत् 1668 (1612 A. D.) and we too possess a different ms on the same topic, dated शालि. शक 1623 (1701 A D.).

† There are four copies of this ms. in the B O R. I. MSS Library

$ Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, No 410.

* Read (a) प्रयोगमिच्छता ज्ञातुं ज्ञेयं कारकमादितः ।-वाररुचसङ्ग्रह, १.

(b) क्रियाकारकसम्बन्धज्ञानमुत्पद्यते यया ।
उत्कृष्टा प्रक्रिया सेयं त्वया सम्प्रति पठ्यताम् ॥
—प्रबोधचन्द्रिका, १।३४.

(c) अथ प्रयोगं जिज्ञासुर्जानीयात् कारकं पुरा ॥
—सज्जनेन्द्रप्रयोगकल्पद्रुम, १

therefore, necessary to teach grammar side by side with literature so as to give immediately concrete illustrations from the latter The first poet who realized the utility and value of quoting concrete examples in the teaching of grammar was भट्टि (5th century A D), who gave the poetic form to the story of राम with the motive of illustrating the rules of grammar in a palatable and interesting way † Grammar thus being efficiently taught in the proper context of literature can be well recollected by young pupils This *tendency of amalgamating grammar and literature* is observable also in the रावणार्जुनीय of भीम or भौमक (7th century), the कविरहस्य of हलायुध (10th century A. D) the द्व्याश्रयकाव्य of हेमचन्द्र (11th century A. D), the वासुदेवविजय of वासुदेव (15th century A. D), the धातुकाव्य of नारायण, the son of वासुदेव (15th century A D), the प्रबोधचन्द्रिका of वैजलभूपति (18th century A. D), and the सज्जनेन्द्रप्रयोगकल्पद्रुम of कृष्णपण्डित (19th century A. D)

We have so far seen that though the वैयाकरणs according to their theory of स्फोट hold that a sentence is an indivisible whole, they mainly resort to the theory of पदसंस्कार or analysis of a word into its crude form (प्रकृति) and affix (प्रत्यय) simply for the sake of beginners, and in this respect they have been

† The commentary 'जयमङ्गला' on the 'भट्टिकाव्य' makes the following remark at its beginning—"लक्ष्य लक्षण चोभयमेकत्र विदुष प्रदर्शयितु श्रीस्वामिसूनु कविर्भट्टिनामा रामकथाश्रयमहाकाव्य चकार।"

influenced by the *etymological method* of यास्क. Then after noticing the chief characteristics of पाणिनि's अष्टाध्यायी it has been shown how पतञ्जलि lent a *scientific aspect to grammar* by adopting the categories of the वैशेषिक्s and the *method of* अन्वय व्यतिरेक belonging to the नैयायिक्s In this context we have seen that the grammarian's own method of analysing words through the direct observation of linguistic phenomena is essentially *inductive*, and that the same method should be followed, with proper limitations, in teaching grammar to young pupils We have *also shown how* पतञ्जलि *himself adopts in his* भाष्य the *methods of etymology, dialogue, and induction.* It has then been pointed out that the system of पाणिनि was very popular with the Buddhists, yet in the absence of a topical arrangement in the अष्टाध्यायी, the study of the whole of पाणिनि's system became unduly long, difficult and tedious to students Then it has been demonstrated that Sanskrit language has undergone several stages of growth and that at last it shows predilection for the *Nominal Style* rather than for the verbal style. Further, after indicating the main features of the nominal style we have shown how the *need of a new grammar like the* कातन्त्र suiting that style was quite natural, and how the कातन्त्र influenced the later grammarians in respect of the order of grammatical topics to be taught. We have then seen that the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी represents the last stage in the *evolution of the arrangement of*

topics, and that वरदराज in his three epitomes of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी changed this order a little for the sake of beginners वरदराज, of course, knew the importance of teaching *nouns before verbs,* yet he thought it necessary to *teach verbs side by side with nouns and before the teaching of participles* Then after referring to the views of दयानन्दसरस्वती and stressing the importance of the *concentric method* in grammar teaching, we have shown that the tendency of teaching *ready-made forms at the initial stage,* as evidenced by some manuals, has grown stronger than that of teaching detailed word-formation, and that after the teaching of ready-made forms of words, young pupils, while reading literature, have been first led *to understand the* कारक *(case-relation),* which is the most important part of Sanskrit grammar Lasly, the *Importance of concrete examples* in grammar teaching and the necessity of *unifying grammar and literature* have been emphasized by quoting actual instances of works representing the harmonization of both In short, the valuable facts that can be derived from the foregoing treatment of Sanskrit grammar are as follows—

(1) Analysis of words (पदसंस्कार) in union with the etymological method is one of the many means of entering into their inner significance Yet etymology is not the only method of approach to language, it must be made subservient to the understanding of the कारक relation in a sentence

(ii) The order of grammatical topics to be taught should be in accordance with the Nominal Style of Sanskrit

(iii) More stress should be laid on the teaching of 'कारक' than on that of verbs, and the detailed formation of verbs should be minimized so as to subserve the knowledge of कारक

(iv) At the initial stage the teaching of ready-made forms of words should be more encouraged than detailed word-formation

(v) Grammar should be taught in the light of literature, i e, in association with concrete examples from literature

(vi) The inductive method and the concentric method may beneficially be applied to the teaching of Sanskrit grammar Their limitations, however, should be recognized

---

VI THE METHODS OF THE मीमासा

It has been so far shown how the वैयाकरणs deal with words (पद) by employing their peculiar methods It is now advisable to turn to the principles of interpreting a sentence (वाक्य) as propounded by the मीमासक्s The मीमासा, or more properly, the पूर्वमीमांसा or कर्ममीमासा primarily institutes an inquiry into the 'धर्म' or duty, which is, according to the

मीमांसकs, the performance of sacrifices for the attainment of heaven. This sacrificial cult held its sway over the ancient Hindu society and induced particularly the sacrificial priests to hold discussions in assemblies or sacrificial sessions on doubtful points of ritualistic practices and on variations in them arising from divergent oral tradition Again, the information about the details of sacrifices embodied in the संहिताs and ब्राह्मणs being scattered and unsystematic led to the divergence of opinions on this subject. It was जैमिनि who first organized all this confused mass of sacrificial lore and transformed it into a system by harmonizing all varying views, by deciding what was principal (शेषिन्, अङ्गिन्, प्रधान) and subordinate (शेष, अङ्ग, गौण), and by assigning a proper place to each of them in the sacrificial scheme He discovered the laws of interpreting Vedic sentences which would guide one in the proper execution of sacrifices As his method of interpretation was based mainly on reasoning, or properly, *deductive reasoning*, the मीमांसा system established by him was otherwise called 'न्याय'. It must be remembered that the term 'न्याय' was originally applied to the conclusive views rationally arrived at in each topic (अधिकरण) with its five parts,$ and was afterwards widely used to indicate the syllogistic reasoning in गौतम's system, which was later than the मीमांसा system Thus each अधिकरण of the

$ विषय, संशय, पूर्वपक्ष, उत्तरपक्ष and सङ्गति.

elements of the sacrificial lore in such a way that all of them should form a synthetic whole All these are, of course, the distinctive features of methodology, and the process resorted to by the मीमांसकs in the interpretation of the Vedic texts is prominently *analytico-synthetic* Thus though from the philosophical point of view the पूर्वमीमांसा is not very important, it can definitely be called ' a system ' on account of its adoption of methodological principles in the interpretation of ritual texts. One may, perhaps, differ from the मीमांसकs in respect of their ideas of अपूर्व or heaven and the utility of sacrifices Yet the *interpretative aspect* of their system is so very important that their principles of interpreting sentences (वाक्य) have deserved the honour of wider application to the religious as well as secular literature Those principles have been particularly employed in the interpretation of Law (धर्मशास्त्र). शङ्कराचार्य, though he differs from the मीमांसकs as regards the ultimate reality of the world and the interpretation of the Upanishadic sentences *relating to* ब्रह्मन्, has accepted their कर्मन् (action) as conducive to the purification of the mind alone, and has made it subservient to the attainment of Self-knowledge An important fact to be noted is that he utilizes the interpretative principles of the पूर्वमीमांसा every now and then, more particularly in the third chapter of his ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्य for establishing the synthesis of Vedic sentences that lead to the *Knowledge of* ब्रह्मन्. Moreover, those interpretative

principles have been discussed at length in the Sanskrit Poetics (साहित्य) and have been more or less accepted by the Sanskrit literary critics It has already been pointed out that the later grammarians too employ the principles of the मीमांसा in their works It may, therefore, be said with certainty that *the interpretative side of the पूर्वमीमांसा has substantially contributed to the general linguistics by stressing the sentence-aspect of language* more than the etymological meanings (समाख्या) of detached words It has properly demonstrated that etymology (and even comparative philology) is a futile process, unless the context of a sentence is taken into account Another important linguistic principle of the मीमांसक is that the *relation between a word and its meaning* being natural and eternal, the word is eternal, and that the word is not created but is simply manifested by the sound The मीमांसक lay down this principle mainly in order to establish their doctrine that the Vedas are eternal and not created by a human author. They further say that words in language primarily connote the genus (जाति, आकृति) and not an individual (व्यक्ति) Although the followers of कुमारिलभट्ट, who propound the theory of अभिहितान्वय (combination of significant words) say that detached words in language are meaningful, they never lose sight of the sentence-aspect of language On the other hand *the प्राभाकर मीमांसक, who uphold the theory of* अन्विताभिधान (signification of syntactical combi-

The first element is the general verbality (आख्यातत्व) which is common to all tenses and moods, and the other is the optativeness (लिङ्त्व) which is peculiar only to the potential mood Both these elements of the same प्रत्यय indicate 'भावना', which is the particular activity in the agent, which is conducive to the production of a thing that is to come into existence According to the मीमांसक this भावना, contained in the affix 'त', is the principal psychological element or the centre to which every part of the Veda is somehow to be connected so as to serve some useful purpose It can thus be seen that the 'भावना' is principally expressed by the affix 'त' to which the root 'यज्' is subordinate. Corresponding to the above two elements of the affix 'त' the 'भावना' (energy) too is of two sorts, viz, शाब्दी (verbal) and आर्थी (of the purpose or fruit) The optativeness (लिङ्त्व) indicates the शाब्दीभावना and the generel verbality (आख्यातत्व) indicates the आर्थी or फलभावना The शाब्दीभावना is of the nature of प्रेरणा (instigation) which produces the आर्थीभावना which is of the nature of प्रवृत्ति (inclination) in the mind of a person The relation, therefore, between the शाब्दीभावना and the आर्थीभावना is respectively that of cause and effect and hence the latter is subordinate to the former In other words, the भावना latently existing in words produces a tendency (प्रवृत्ति) in a person to bring into being some action Thus the आर्थीभावना or प्रवृत्ति further

causes the action of sacrifice (याग), denoted by the root-meaning of यज्, to come into being. If 'भावना' means 'that which causes something to come into being', (भावयति, साधयति, करोति), the meaning of the affix 'त' is "भावयेत्' (should be brought into being). Both these भावनाs, which can be expressed by the verb 'भावयेत्' require, therefore, three factors in order to bring something into being, viz., the object or fruit (साध्य), the means (साधन) and the procedure (इतिकर्तव्यता), which correspondingly induce us to ask questions, as 'किं भावयेत्' (what), 'केन भावयेत्' (by what means) and 'कथं भावयेत्' (how). In short the भावना denoted by the verb 'भावयेत्' has the expectancy (आकाङ्क्षा) of साध्य, साधन and इतिकर्तव्यता; and this expectancy, which gives rise to the above questions in our mind, is fulfilled in the following way. In the case of the शाब्दीभावना, which is of the nature of instigation (प्रेरणा), the object (साध्य) is the आर्थी भावना or tendency (प्रवृत्ति) instigated, the means (साधन) is the knowledge of the potential, etc. (लिङादिज्ञान), and the mode of performance (इतिकर्तव्यता) is shown by the recommendatory texts (अर्थवादवाक्यs); while in the case of the आर्थीभावना the fruit or object (फल, साध्य) is 'heaven', the means is the 'sacrifice' (याग) which is known from the meaning of the root यज्, and the manner of performance is indicated by the several accessory rites (अङ्ग) of the sacrifice like 'प्रयाज' etc. Thus the whole

the relation between the subordinate (अङ्ग) and the principal (प्रधान), as 'दध्ना जुहोति' (One should sacrifice with curds) This sentence lays down the connection of the subsidiary thing 'curds' with the principal thing 'sacrifice' by means of the instrumental case of the word 'दधि', and is interpreted as 'दध्ना होम भावयेत्' (One should bring into being the sacrifice by means of curds) In such a गुणविधि (injunction of the subsidiary) the root-meaning (i e होम) is construed as the object (कर्म) or that which is to be accomplished (साध्य). The various subsidiaries are the details of a sacrifice, such as, the substances (द्रव्य), the Vedic मन्त्रs, the deities and several sacrificial acts like the threshing of corn, while principal thing is the sacrifice, which is laid down by the उत्पत्तिविधि like 'अग्निहोत्र जुहोति', and which through the अपूर्व (transcendental result) leads to heaven The विनियोगविधि, therefore, subordinates itself to the उत्पत्तिविधि which is principal, and lays down the details of the procedure to be followed in a sacrifice This process of subordinating the details of a sacrifice to the उत्पत्तिविधि is carried on through six means of proof (प्रमाण), which are auxiliary to the विनियोगविधि The six means of proof are. (i) श्रुति or direct statement, (ii) लिङ्ग-mark or word-meaning, (iii) वाक्य-syntactical connection or sentence, (iv) प्रकरण or context, (v) स्थान or position and (vi) समाख्या or name The मीमांसकs have exhibited logical acumen in proving that each

preceding one of these प्रमाणs is stronger than each succeeding one; and the rules of interpretation enunciated by them in this respect not only indicate the relation of the subsidiary to the principal or of parts to the whole of a sacrifice, but are also *linguistically valuable for ascertaining the relative strength of the different parts of language and arriving at the correct interpretation of a literary or scientific work.*

(i) श्रुति–Now श्रुति is the direct statement or express declaration. It conveys its meaning directly without the aid of any intermediate steps which are necessary in the remaining five means of proof. This means of proof, which is the strongest of all, lays stress on the express meaning of words and sentences. The reason why श्रुति is stronger than लिङ्ग (mark) and other means of proof is that in the latter there is no direct statement which would make us instantly apply the subsidiary to the principal, but it has to be assumed or inferred from the sentence possessing the लिङ्ग etc. But before such an applicatory statement is inferred from the लिङ्ग and others, the direct statement which is already existing makes its immediate application, and the assumption or inference is rendered useless. For instance, in the verse 'कदाचन स्तरीरसि नेन्द्र सश्चसि दाशुषे' (O Indra, you never destroy him who offers you an oblation, but you favour him), there is the mention of Indra. On account of the suggestive word or mark 'इन्द्र' we might think that a statement like 'ऐन्द्या 'इन्द्र-

मुपतिष्ठते' should be assumed, and that the verse should be applied to the worship of Indra. But there already exists a direct statement 'ऐन्द्या गार्हपत्यमुपतिष्ठते' (One should worship the गार्हपत्य fire with the verse containing the mark of Indra), in which the word 'गार्हपत्यम्' in the accusative case makes us instantly apply that verse to the worship of the गार्हपत्य fire. For, श्रुति reaches the stage of application (विनियोग) through only one step of the denotation of its own sense (स्वाभिधेयप्रतिपादन), while लिङ्ग reaches the stage of application through two intermediate steps of स्वाभिधेयप्रतिपादन and श्रुतिकल्पना (assumption of a श्रुति). In other words, श्रुति being nearer विनियोग than लिङ्ग is stronger than the latter. Thus when there is a conflict between a direct statement (श्रुति) and a suggestive word or mark (लिङ्ग), the former prevails over the latter.

(ii) लिङ्ग–The power of a word to convey some meaning is called 'लिङ्ग'. In other words, the power of a word is the conventional sense (रूढि) itself. This लिङ्ग, *therefore, which denotes the* conventional or primary sense, must be differentiated from समाख्या (name) which conveys the etymological (यौगिक) or secondary sense For instance, in the sentence 'बर्हिर्देवसदनं दामि' (I cut grass for the seat of the gods) the word 'बर्हिस्' may mean any kind of grass like कुश, उल्प etc. But as it primarily denotes कुश grass and secondarily उल्प grass, the primary sense is to be understood in the above

sentence and not the secondary one The लिङ्ग (mark) becomes applicable when there is no direct statement (श्रुति) which has, of course, to be assumed from the लिङ्ग This लिङ्ग is stronger than syntactical relation (वाक्य) and the succeeding means of proof For instance, the मन्त्र "स्योनं ते सदनं कृणोमि घृतस्य धारया सुशेवं कल्पयामि । तस्मिन्सीदामृते प्रतितिष्ठ व्रीहीणां मेध सुमनस्यमानः ॥" [O पुरोडाश, I make a pleasant seat for you I make it acceptable to you with a stream of ghee, sit on it, rest on that immortal seat with pleasure, O marrow of the rice-grains] is a sentence containing two clauses 'स्योनं.. कल्पयामि' and 'सीद.. सुमनस्यमान' which are joined by 'तस्मिन्'. The word 'तस्मिन्' gives rise to आकाङ्क्षा and we ask a question 'कस्मिन्' (where) This expectancy is fulfilled by the first clause which being syntactically connected with the second makes up the whole sentence If we shall give prominence to this syntactical connection, we shall have to suppose that the whole मन्त्र as one sentence is to be repeated for making the seat of the पुरोडाश as well as for placing the पुरोडाश on that seat In this case we shall have to suppose that instead of two clauses there is only one sentence which, as a whole, may be applied by cumulation (समुच्चय) or by option (विकल्प) to the two actions of 'making the seat' (सदन) and 'placing on it' (सादन) The मीमांसक्s, however, forbid this, and say that only the first clause is to be used as subsidiary to the action

of 'सदन' on account of the लिङ्ग 'सदन कृणोमि', and that only the second clause is to be made subservient to the action of 'सादन' on account of the लिङ्ग 'तस्मिन् सीद'. If we suppose that the whole sentence is to be applied to the making of seat (सदन), we shall have to take for granted that the second clause has the power to denote the sense of 'सदन' which is not denoted by it Similarly, if the whole sentence would be made applicable to the placing (सादन) of the पुरोडाश, the first clause which has no power to yield that sense would have to be supposed to convey it. If we thus proceed on the evidence of वाक्य, we shall reach the stage of विनियोग through the three steps of वाक्य, लिङ्ग and श्रुति, while if we, on the evidence of the लिङ्ग 'सदन कृणोमि' take only the first clause to apply to सदन, we reach the stage of विनियोग through only two steps of लिङ्ग and श्रुति. The same can be said about the लिङ्ग of सादन in the second clause All this, therefore, proves that लिङ्ग is stronger than वाक्य or syntactical relation.

(iii) वाक्य or syntactical relation is the connected utterance of words indicating things that are mutually subsidiary and principal This means that a sentence does not necessarily consist only of words in the accusative and other cases Even in the absence of those cases two words standing together in the relation of an adjective and a substantive can form syntactical relation. The example of this वाक्य is found in 'यस्य पर्णमयी जुहूर्भवति न स पापं श्लोक

शृणोति' [He, whose ladle is made of पलाश wood, does not spoil his fame], where the words 'पर्णमयी जुहूः' are uttered connectedly. Again, the relation between 'पर्णमयी' and 'जुहूः' is respectively that of the subsidiary and the principal, or 'पर्णमयी' is the adjective of 'जुहूः'. The whole expression 'पर्णमयी जुहूः' can, therefore, be called a वाक्य.

This syntactical relation is stronger than context (प्रकरण). For example, in the context (प्रकरण) of 'दर्शपूर्णमास' sacrifice the following sentences occur: (a) "अग्नीषोमाविद हविरजुषेताम्, अवीवृधेताम्, महो ज्यायोऽक्राताम्" and (b) 'इन्द्राग्नी इद हविरजुषेताम्, अवीवृधेताम्, महो ज्यायोऽक्राताम्' ['O Agni-Soma, you have accepted this offering, you have increased it, you have made superior splendour', and 'O इन्द्राग्नी, you have accepted the offering' etc]. It must be remembered here that the deities of the full-moon sacrifice (पूर्णमासयाग) have been decided to be 'अग्नीषोमौ', and those of the new-moon sacrifice (दर्शयाग) to be 'इन्द्राग्नी'. Now if we lay stress on the प्रकरण of दर्शपूर्णमास, we shall have to recite both the मन्त्s at the time of the new-moon sacrifice as well as the full-moon sacrifice That is, in the दर्शयाग we shall have to recite the whole of the second मन्त्र along with that part of the first मन्त्र which remains after dropping the word 'अग्नीषोमौ', and in the पूर्णमासयाग we shall have to recite the whole of the first मन्त्र along with that part of the second मन्त्र which remains after dropping the word 'इन्द्राग्नी'. But in this process

both the मन्त्रs will have to be construed by us without any direct statement to that effect For this construing we shall have to assume, on the strength of the प्रकरण, that both the मन्त्रs form one sentence (वाक्य). Secondly, in the *first* मन्त्र, which properly refers to अग्नीषोमौ, we shall have to assume the लिङ्ग of इन्द्राग्नी. Thirdly, we shall have to infer a श्रुति enjoining upon us to perform the act relating to इन्द्राग्नी, and lastly, we shall reach the stage of विनियोग. Thus if we start from the प्रकरण, we reach the stage of विनियोग through the four steps of प्रकरण, वाक्य, लिङ्ग and श्रुति. If, on the other hand, the वाक्य is taken into account, the word 'अग्नीषोमौ' naturally forms a syntactical whole with the remaining part of the first मन्त्र, viz, 'इद हवि ..अक्राताम्', and we reach the stage of विनियोग through the three steps of वाक्य, लिङ्ग and श्रुति. Thus प्रकरण being more remote than वाक्य from विनियोग, the वाक्य sets aside the प्रकरण. It is then ascertained that the first मन्त्र is subsidiary only to the पूर्णमासयाग and the second only to the दर्शयाग.

Here it may incidentally be told that the दर्शपूर्णमास sacrifice is a primary form of the sacrifice or an archetype (प्रकृति) in which all the subsidiaries of the rite are stated, while 'सौर्य', 'श्येन' *etc*, *are* called 'modifications' (विकृति) where all the subsidiaries are not stated, and some that are not stated find their place in the विकृतिs by the *rule of transfer* (चोदक, अतिदेश) from the प्रकृति or arche-

type, that is, the subsidiaries belonging to the प्रकृति are transferred to the विकृतिs for their performance. The rule of transfer (अतिदेश) formulated by the मीमासकs has, as we have already seen, been *used on a wider basis in grammar and other* शास्त्रs.

(iv) प्रकरण (context, topic) is defined as 'inter-dependence' or mutual expectancy of sentences. In other words, sentences mutually expectant (साकाङ्क्ष) of each other for the purpose of completing their unified sense make up a प्रकरण. Just as words in one sentence are expectant of one another for yielding a complete and unified sense of themselves, so several sentences in a प्रकरण are expectant of one another so as to yield a complete and unified sense of themselves This mutual expectancy of sentences is called a प्रकरण. The प्रकरण may, therefore, correspond to a paragraph or a section on a particular subject For instance, in the प्रकरण of दर्शपूर्णमास there are sentences, (1) 'दर्शपूर्णमासाभ्या स्वर्गकामो यजेत' (One desirous of heaven should bring it into being by means of दर्शपूर्णमास) and (2) 'समिधो यजति' (He should bring it into being by means of the समिध् sacrifice), which are connected with the प्रयाज, the subsidiary of दर्शपूर्णमास. Both these sentences are expectant of each other The first sentence has the expectancy as to *how* स्वर्ग is to be brought into being (कथमावाकाङ्क्षा, उपकारकाकाङ्क्षा), and it is fulfilled by the second sentence, while the second sentence has the expectancy as to *what* is

to be brought into being by means of the समिध् sacrifice (साध्याकाङ्क्षा, उपकार्याकाङ्क्षा), and it is fulfilled by the first sentence which indicates the fruit 'स्वर्ग'. Thus both these expectant sentences form the प्रकरण of दर्शपूर्णमास, of which the दर्शपूर्णमासविधि laid down by the first sentence is principal (अङ्गिन्), to which the प्रयाजविधि laid down by the second sentence is subordinate (अङ्ग)

The प्रकरण (topic, context) is stronger than स्थान (proximity or position). For instance, in the प्रकरण of राजसूय sacrifice many sacrifices like पशुयागs and सोमयागs have been prescribed Among them is mentioned a सोमयाग called 'अभिषेचनीय' in the proximity (सानिध्य) of which acts like gambling etc, are stated in the sentences 'अक्षैर्दीव्यति, राजन्य जिनाति, शौन शेपमाख्यापयति' [He should play at dice, he should conquer kings, he should cause the legend of शुनःशेप to be told] As these acts occur in the proximity of the अभिषेचनीय, it appears at first sight that they are the subsidiaries of the अभिषेचनीय But the अभिषेचनीय being a modification (विकृति) of ज्योतिष्टोम has no expectancy about the procedure (कथभावाकाङ्क्षा), for, the subsidiaries from the प्रकृति 'ज्योतिष्टोम' are to be transferred to the विकृति, and thus no expectancy (आकाङ्क्षा) is left On the other hand, the विधि "राजा स्वाराज्यकामो राजसूयेन यजेत = राजसूयेन यागेन स्वाराज्य भावयेत्" [A king desirous of heaven's sovereignty should bring it into being by means of the राजसूय

sacrifice] in the actual राजसूयप्रकरण in hand gives rise to the expectancy as to *how* it [स्वाराज्य] should be brought into being (कथंमावाकाङ्क्षा); and that expectancy is satisfied by the sentences 'अक्षैर्दीव्यति...आस्यापयति'; again, the expectancy roused by these sentences as to *what* should be brought into being (साध्याकाङ्क्षा) is satisfied by 'स्वाराज्यकामो...यजेत'. Both of them thus depending upon each other form a प्रकरण. On the strength of the actual प्रकरण, therefore, the acts like gambling etc., become the subsidiaries of the राजसूय and not of the अभिषेचनीय on the strength of their proximity (स्थान). If प्रकरण is taken into account, we can reach the stage of विनियोग through प्रकरण, वाक्य, लिङ्ग and श्रुति; while if we pay attention to स्थान, we add one more step and reach the stage of विनियोग through स्थान, प्रकरण, वाक्य, लिङ्ग and श्रुति. Thus प्रकरण being nearer to विनियोग than स्थान is stronger than the latter.

(v) स्थान (position) means common location (देशसामान्य) or order of succession (क्रम). It is of two kinds: common location according to the text (पाठसादेश्य) and common location according to the performance (अनुष्ठानसादेश्य). पाठसादेश्य is again subdivided into 'the text according to number' (यथासङ्ख्यपाठ) and 'text according to proximity' (संनिधिपाठ). This स्थान is stronger than 'name' or a word which conveys the etymological sense (समाख्या). In the दर्शपूर्णमासप्रकरण there is a section,

which gives information about 'पुरोडाश', and is, therefore, called 'पौरोडाशिक'. 'पौरोडाशिक' (related to the पुरोडाश) is a name (समाख्या), which is etymologically formed by applying a तद्धितप्रत्यय to the word 'पुरोडाश'. That section also mentions सान्नाय्यपात्रs (vessels for milk and curds) and पुरोडाशपात्रs (implements like the pestle, mortar etc., required for the पुरोडाश) The same section again gives a मन्त्र about the purification of the vessels, as 'शुन्धध्वं दैव्याय कर्मणे' (O vessels, become purified for the divine rite) Here we have to decide whether the सान्नाय्यपात्रs are to be purified with this मन्त्र or the पुरोडाशपात्रs. If we rely on the समाख्या of the word 'पौरोडाशिक', the मन्त्र will have to be used while purifying the सान्नाय्यपात्रs as well as the पुरोडाशपात्रs, as they all occur in the same पौरोडाशिक section But if the position or common location of the मन्त्र is taken into consideration, we find that the मन्त्र occurs in the proximity of the सान्नाय्यपात्रs It should, therefore, be used in connection with the purification of the सान्नाय्यपात्रs and not of the पुरोडाशपात्रs, though it occurs in the पौरोडाशिक काण्ड The स्थान is evidently nearer to the विनियोग than the समाख्या This actual position or proximity of the मन्त्र is more directly known by us than the position of it inferred from समाख्या स्थान is, therefore, a stronger means of proof than समाख्या.

(vi) समाख्या or 'name' is the last and the weakest of all the six means of proof. As already

explained, समाख्या is a *word which depends upon* etymology for its meaning This समाख्या becomes subordinately useful for determining which parts of the sacrifice are to be performed by whom For instance, the समाख्याs 'हौत्रम्,' 'आध्वर्यवम्' and 'औद्गात्रम्' help us in settling respectively that some parts of the sacrifice are to be performed by the होतृ priest of the ऋग्वेद, some by the अध्वर्यु priest of the यजुर्वेद and some by the उद्गातृ priest *of the* सामवेद. The समाख्या 'होतृचमस' shows that the सोम juice contained in the चमस (cup) is to be drunk by the होतृ priest In other words, we can determine the विनियोग (application) that the होतृ becomes the subsidiary to the drinking of the सोम from the cup It should be remembered that the समाख्या is to be adopted as the last resort when other means of proof fail The मीमांसा has rightly given the last place to समाख्या in the matter of interpretation. This principle is of far-reaching importance and *deserves to be well borne in mind by the etymologists and philologists who deal with detached words* bereft of their relation in a sentence or paragraph A somewhat detailed treatment of the above six प्रमाणs of the विनियोगविधि is purposely adopted here on account of their *linguistic importance and general application to other* शास्त्रs Besides, the विनियोगविधि, which shows *the relative value of the principal and subsidiary,* is *a distinctive feature of the methodology of the*

मीमांसक*s*. It may also be added that the विनियोगविधि is calculated to *guide a teacher* in determining the principal and subordinate parts of a text to be interpreted and in giving him *a proper perspective of the subject-matter* which he is preparing for presentation.

(3) Now the प्रयोगविधि or injunction of performance is a natural development of the विनियोगविधि, since what is determined to be subordinate and principal by the विनियोगविधि is actually performed or brought into practice according to the प्रयोगविधि by following the order of succession in the various acts of the sacrifice, so that the speedy performance of the acts enjoined should be facilitated without unnecessary delay The प्रयोगविधि thus tells us how the subordinate and principal acts are to be combined into an organic whole and what subsidiaries are to succeed what according to their order of succession. When several sentences indicative of the principal and subordinate acts are combined, there emerges from them one syntactical whole or महावाक्य, the combined meaning of which is the प्रयोगविधि itself If this syntactical whole is to be maintained, the various acts of a sacrifice will have to be performed briskly or without delay. For, delay in action prevents us from realizing the unification or association that a particular thing is connected with another, and the syntactical unity pre-determined by us is spoiled. It is for this reason that connected or uninterrupted performance

of acts in their definite order (क्रम) is enjoined by the प्रयोगविधि, which is, therefore, also defined as the विधि laying down the order of the subsidiaries This order is a particular kind of extension (विततिविशेष) or the sequence (पौर्वापर्य) of acts, according to which we know which thing should succeed which In this प्रयोगविधि too there are six means of proof which are instrumental in deciding the order in which various acts of the sacrifice should be performed They are (i) श्रुतिक्रम or order determined by direct enunciation, (ii) अर्थक्रम or order determined by purpose, (iii) पाठक्रम or order in the text, (iv) स्थानक्रम or order according to position, (v) मुख्यक्रम or order based on the principal matter, and (vi) प्रवृत्तिक्रम or order by procedure Here also each preceding प्रमाण prevails over the succeeding one This discussion of order is also calculated to be *helpful to teachers* in deciding which step in their actual procedure of teaching should follow which

(4) The अधिकारविधि (injunction of qualification) *is that which indicates the ownership* or the right of enjoyment of the fruit resulting from an action. The sentence 'यजेत स्वर्गकाम' is an example of this विधि, because it intimates that the man desirous of the fruit 'heaven' becomes the enjoyer of it by means of a sacrifice Corresponding to the distinction of कर्मन्s into काम्य (performed with a special desire), नैमित्तिक (occasional) and नित्य (daily) the

three *qualifications* (अधिकार) *required* by the performer of a rite are respectively फलकामना (the desire for a particular result or fruit), निमित्तनिश्चय (ascertainment of the occasion) and शुचिविहितकालजीवित्व (leading a pure life and performing duties at the *fixed times*) The *three more* qualifications added to these are विद्या (study and knowledge of the Veda), अग्निमत्ता (the laying of fires) and सामर्थ्य (competency) As every शास्त्र discusses the particular qualifications of the person resorting to it, so it is natural for the पूर्वमीमांसा to enumerate the qualifications required by the performer of a rite Although the above qualifications are special to the पूर्वमीमांसा, yet leaving aside their particular senses, if we take their general senses, it will not be too far-fetched to apply those qualifications *except* 'अग्निमत्ता' *to any person given to worthy pursuits* and to a teacher A teacher too should have a desire to achieve a definite result should ascertain special occasions, *should lead a pure life* and perform his duties at the fixed times should possess a sound knowledge of his subject and have competency to impart it to others

So far we have dealt with the four chief classes of विधि, viz, उत्पत्तिविधि, विनियोगविधि, प्रयोगविधि and अधिकार विधि The विधि is again classified on a different basis into अपूर्वविधि, नियमविधि and परिसङ्ख्याविधि, all of which tell us whether we should execute a command in them *wholly* or *partially* The following verse describes the general nature of these three विधिs—

विधिरत्यन्तमप्राप्तौ, नियमः पाक्षिके सति ।
तत्र चान्यत्र च प्राप्तौ परिसङ्ख्येति गीयते ॥

"The विधि or अपूर्वविधि (a new injunction) occurs when something is wholly non-existent; the नियमविधि (a restrictive injunction) occurs when something is partially non-existent; and the परिसङ्ख्याविधि (exclusive specification) occurs when, out of two alternatives equally existent or present, one is excluded." In other words, the अपूर्वविधि lays down something new (अपूर्व) which is not established by any other means of proof. When, out of many means, by which an action can be performed, one means is naturally present, while the other is not present, the नियमविधि restricts us to the use of that other which is not present. 'व्रीहीनवहन्ति' (He should beat the rice-grains) is an example of the नियमविधि. This sentence is not meant to indicate that the husk of grains can be removed by beating. It being a matter of common experience that when the rice-grains are beaten, the husks are removed from them, and when they are not beaten, the husks are not removed, a special sentence laying down this injunction is unnecessary. The real purpose of the sentence is, however, to restrict us to a means which is not present. We can remove the husk either by नखविदलन (separating with finger-nails) or by अवहनन (beating). Out of these two means if we suppose that the alternative of नखविदलन is naturally present (पक्षे प्राप्त) and that of अवहनन is not present (पक्षे अप्राप्त), then the sentence

'व्रीहीनवहन्ति' restricts us to अवहनन only and is, therefore, the example of the नियमविधि.

When two alternatives are simultaneously present (युगपत्प्राप्त), the परिसङ्ख्याविधि excludes one of them. 'पञ्च पञ्चनखाः भक्ष्याः [Five five-nailed animals are to be eaten] is the stock example of परिसङ्ख्या (exclusion). It is not meant to lay down the eating of five-nailed animals. For, it is generally found that men are naturally inclined without any discrimination to eat the flesh of all animals, five-nailed ones (पञ्चनख) as well as those that do not possess five nails (अपञ्चनख). Both the eating of five-nailed animals (पञ्चनखभक्षण) and the eating of those without five nails (अपञ्चनखभक्षण) are, therefore, simultaneously present owing to the natural inclination (रागतः प्राप्त) of man. As पञ्चनखभक्षण is not wholly non-existent (अत्यन्त अप्राप्त), and as no new injunction is necessary when something is done out of natural inclination, *the sentence* '*पञ्च पञ्चनखाः भक्ष्याः*' *cannot* be an example of अपूर्वविधि. Nor is it an example of नियमविधि, because पञ्चनखभक्षण is not partially non-existent (पक्षे अप्राप्त), but is wholly existent or established (प्राप्त). Human beings allay their hunger by means of पञ्चनखभक्षण as well as अपञ्चनखभक्षण, which both are simultaneously existent or present (युगपत्प्राप्त). *According to the principle of residuum* (परिशेष), therefore, the sentence 'पञ्च पञ्चनखाः भक्ष्याः' must be an example of परिसङ्ख्या (exclusion). This विधि then wants us to desist from

अपञ्चनखभक्षण which is other than पञ्चनखभक्षण. The eating of five-nailed animals (पञ्चनखभक्षण) has thus to be understood as equivalent to the exclusion of the animals that are not five-nailed (अपञ्चनखभक्षण-निवृत्ति) Now 'पञ्च पञ्चनखा भक्ष्या' is an example of *implied exclusion* (लाक्षणिकी परिसङ्ख्या), as the word 'एव' (only) is not directly stated in it, while 'अत्र हि एव आवपति' (Here only, i e, in the three verses of पवमानस्तोत्र alone they should insert extra words) is an example of *expressed exclusion* (श्रौती परिसङ्ख्या), as the word 'एव' is directly stated in it The implied exclusion involves three faults, viz, श्रुतहानि (abandonment of the direct sense), अश्रुत कल्पना (assumption of what is not directly stated), and प्राप्तबाध (rejection of what is already existing or present) For instance, in understanding the sense 'अपञ्चनखभक्षणनिवृत्ति' from 'पञ्चनखभक्षण' we abandon the direct sense of पञ्चनखभक्षण, assume another sense 'अपञ्चनखभक्षणनिवृत्ति' which is not directly stated, and also reject 'अपञ्चनखभक्षण' which is already established by natural inclination The श्रौती परिसङ्ख्या in 'अत्र ह्येवावपन्ति', however, involves only one fault of प्राप्तबाध on account of the direct statement of 'एव'. *It is necessary to understand these details* of the नियमविधि and परिसङ्ख्याविधि, as both of them are *general rules of interpretation widely used in other* शास्त्र*s, particularly in grammar and law.*

After this treatment of the विधि, the first main division of the Veda, it is now advisable to turn to

the remaining four main divisions of the same, viz, मन्त्र, नामधेय, निषेध and अर्थवाद, which are subordinately helpful to the विधि in one way or another. Of them the मन्त्रs or sacred formulas remind us of the meanings of things connected with sacrifices. When this is their visible purpose (दृष्टफलकत्व), it is improper to assume an invisible result (अदृष्टकल्पना) of their recitation. As every part of the Veda is considered to be purposeful or meaningful, the 'Names' (नामधेय) which are words (proper nouns) rather than sentences, are also useful in making definite the character of a sacrifice to be performed. The मीमांसकs purposely accept this division (i. e. नामधेय) of the Veda for four reasons (i) There is the danger of resorting to possessive implication (मत्वर्थलक्षणाभय), (ii) there is the danger of adopting the syntactical split (वाक्यभेदभय) or the fault of understanding a single sentence as enjoining two different things at once, (iii) there is another scriptural text prescribing an accessory (तत्प्रख्यशास्त्र); and (iv) there is comparison with another thing (तद्व्यपदेश) The मीमांसकs have exhibited subtle analytical power in the discussion of these four reasons It may incidentally be pointed out that *the avoidance of the* वाक्यभेद is an *important* principle used in law

The fourth division of the Veda is 'निषेध' (a negative injunction or prohibition) which is a sentence turning a man away from some action that causes an undesirable *result*. Just *as a*

विधि like 'यजेत स्वर्गकामः' suggests that a man performing a sacrifice would achieve a desirable result, and *impels* (प्रवर्तयति) him to perform the sacrifice, so a निषेध like 'न कलञ्जं भक्षयेत्' (One should not eat meat stuck with a poisoned arrow) suggests that the eating of poisoned flesh leads to an undesirable result and *turns* a man *away from* (निवर्तयति) that action. The मीमांसकs have shown much insight into language by discussing whether the negative word 'नञ्' is to be construed with *the potential affix* or *the root-meaning* or a noun; and this topic has much bearing on the interpretation of sentences. In the निषेध the negative word 'नञ्' is generally to be construed with the potential affix which expresses भावना. It has already been shown that the verb is the principal element in a sentence and that in the verb too the potential affix expressing भावना is more important. It has also been seen that a verb contains two elements, viz., the root-meaning (धात्वर्थ) and the meaning of the affix (प्रत्ययार्थ). The root-meaning '*eating*' (भक्षण) in the verb 'भक्षयेत्' is subordinately related as an instrument (साधन) to the principal element, i. e, the affix which expresses भावना, as the verb 'भक्षयेत्' is equivalent to 'भक्षणेन इष्टं भावयेत्'. Thus the root-meaning 'भक्षण' which is subordinate (उपसर्जनीभूत) cannot be construed with 'नञ्', since a subordinate word cannot be construed independently of the principal

becomes free from so much sin] This वाक्यशेष, which yields the sense of 'पापक्षय' (removal of sin) and becomes the साध्य, forms a syntactical whole with 'नेक्षेतोद्यन्तमादित्यम्', and the whole then means 'आदित्यविषयकानीक्षणसङ्कल्पेन पापक्षयं भावयेत्' [He should bring into being the removal of sin by observing the vow of not looking at the sun]. This becomes, therefore, a पर्युदास or a positive command tinged with negation

The second difficulty is the contingency of an option in the case of understanding a sentence as a निषेध In order to avoid this contingency it is sometimes necessary to resort to a पर्युदास, the instance of which is found in 'यजतिषु ये-यजामहं करोति, नानुयाजेषु (ये-यजामहं करोति)' [He should say 'ये यजामहे' in the याज्याs but not in the अनुयाजs] It has been settled by the मीमांसकs that the होतृ-priest should first utter the words 'ये यजामहे' at the places where oblations are to be offered after the अध्वर्यु's command 'यज', and then he should recite the याज्याs (sacrificial formulas) Again, it has been stated that the words 'ये यजामहे' are not to be added before the मन्त्रs for the अनुयाजs (three offerings of ghee)

Here the *prima facie* view is that the first part 'यजतिषु ये-यजामहं करोति' expresses a विधि, while if in the latter part 'नानुयाजेषु (ये-यजामहं करोति)' 'न' is construed with the affix in 'करोति' (understood), 'नानुयाजेषु' etc. expresses a प्रतिषेध, which prohibits what is already established (प्राप्त) by the विधि in the

first part This प्रतिषेध then means "He should not say 'ये यजामहे' in the अनुयाजs" As we have here *two scriptural texts of equal force opposing each* other, there is an *option* (विकल्प) as to what is to be done and *no annulment* (बाध). For, a बाध occurs when a passion (for the murder of a ब्राह्मण, for instance) is already existent (प्राप्त) and when it is annulled by a stronger scriptural passage (as, ब्राह्मणो न हन्तव्य) As this is not the case with the विधि and निषेध in 'यजतिषु ये-यजामहं करोति, नानुयाजेषु', i e, *as both the* विधि *and* निषेध *are of equal force*, we should take this as an option (विकल्प) instead of बाध Again, two scriptural passages which are mutually independent can annul each other, and then a बाध would take place But the निषेध in 'न अनुयाजेषु' is dependent on the preceding विधि in 'यजतिषु॰' etc, for the completion of its own meaning and for the establishment of what is prohibited. When, therefore, one scriptural passage prohibits what is laid down by another scriptural passage, only विकल्प is possible and not बाध, as both the *passages are authoritative*

The *conclusive view* is that it is not proper to assume a विकल्प here, as both the scriptural texts become unauthoritative thereby In other words, if it is held that 'यजतिषु ये-यजामहं करोति' is true, the words-'ये-यजामहं करोति' used with 'नानुयाजेषु' become unauthoritative A विकल्प should, therefore be avoided as far as possible, as it involves faults Again,

in the case of a विकल्प we have to assume a double unseen result (अपूर्व), one for a विधि and another for a प्रतिषेध, since the विधि and the प्रतिषेध in the present instance would be for the good of man (पुरुषार्थ) and not for the sake of the rite (क्रत्वर्थ) 'नानुयाजेषु ये-यजामहं करोति' should, therefore, be understood as a पर्युदास (exception) by construing 'नञ्' with 'अनुयाजेषु', and not as a प्रतिषेध (negation), where 'नञ्' is construed with the affix in 'करोति'. When we thus resort to पर्युदास and construe 'नञ्' with 'अनुयाजेषु', the words 'न + अनुयाजेषु' are by लक्षणा equivalent to अनुयाजव्यतिरिक्तेषु' (to the exclusion of the अनुयाजs), and the whole sentence 'नानुयाजेषु ये-यजामहं करोति' means 'अनुयाजव्यतिरिक्तेषु यजतिषु ये-यजामहं इति मन्त्रं कुर्यात्' (He should use the मन्त्र 'ये यजामहे' with the याज्याs which are excluded by the अनुयाजs) Thus when we take this as a पर्युदास, the opposition between two scriptural texts of equal force occuring in the विकल्प does not arise. In this पर्युदास 'ये-यजामहं' is not a new विधि, but is simply an allusion (अनुवाद) to what has been laid down in the general rule 'यजतिषु ये-यजामहं करोति', and this अनुवाद is resorted to only in order to make an exception in the case of the अनुयाजs

It is thus found that a पर्युदास (*exclusion*) restricts a general rule An उपसंहार (restriction) too does the same yet the difference between both of them is that a पर्युदास restricts a general rule only to what is *other than* the particular case stated in the

पर्युदास, while an उपसंहार restricts a general rule only to the particular case that is stated in the उपसंहार itself Again, a पर्युदास is negative, while an उपसंहार is positive For instance, the four-fold division of पुरोडाश mentioned in the general rule 'पुरोडाशं चतुर्धा करोति' (He divides the पुरोडाश into four parts) is restricted only to the 'आग्नेय पुरोडाश' owing to the particular sentence, 'आग्नेयं चतुर्धा करोति' (He *divides* the आग्नेय पुरोडाश into four parts), which is an example of उपसंहार.

In spite of the contingency of the faulty विकल्प, we have sometimes inevitably to resort to प्रतिषेध (prohibition) rather than to पर्युदास. पर्युदास is an exception to प्रतिषेध, but the प्रतिषेध resorted to in such a case is an exception to the पर्युदास, i e, प्रतिप्रसव (*an exception to an exception*) In *the* अतिरात्र (a form of ज्योतिष्टोम sacrifice) there are two sentences, of which 'अतिरात्रे षोडशिनं गृह्णाति' (At the अतिरात्र he should take the षोडशिन् cup) is a विधि, *and* 'नातिरात्रे षोडशिनं गृह्णाति' (At the अतिरात्र he should not take the षोडशिन् cup) is a निषेध A विकल्प which is faulty is, therefore, contingent here If it is to be avoided, we have to resort to पर्युदास, in which 'नञ्' will have to be construed with either of the nouns 'अतिरात्रे' or 'षोडशिनम्'. Then the second (negative) sentence will respectively assume the form of either 'अतिरात्रव्यतिरिक्ते षोडशिनं गृह्णाति' (He should take the षोडशिन् at the sacrifices other than the अतिरात्र)

or 'अतिरात्रे षोडशिव्यतिरिक्त गृह्णाति' (He should take the cups other than the षोडशिन् at the अतिरात्र). As both these meanings are quite contrary to the विधि 'अतिरात्रे षोडशिन गृह्णाति', it is impossible to assume a पर्युदास here. Hence, by construing नञ् with the प्रत्ययार्थ the sentence 'नातिरात्रे षोडशिन गृह्णाति' must inevitably be taken to be a प्रतिषेध (prohibition) of 'अतिरात्रे षोडशिन गृह्णाति', although there is the contingency of विकल्प in this. It has already been shown that a प्रतिषेध like 'न कलञ्ज भक्षयेत्' prohibits that which leads us to an undesirable result (अनर्थ). In other words, this प्रतिषेध is meant for the good of man (पुरुषार्थ). But the प्रतिषेध of taking the षोडशिन् cup does not lead us to an undesirable result, as it is laid down for the sake of the sacrifice (क्रत्वर्थ), and not for the good of man (पुरुषार्थ). The विकल्प, therefore, that has *to be admitted on account of this प्रतिषेध is not faulty.* There are two classes of विकल्प, viz, व्यवस्थित (fixed or limited) and अव्यवस्थित (unlimited). The विकल्पs *which are fixed or which depend upon the will of* the agent are not faulty. The nice distinction made by the मीमांसक between प्रतिषेध and पर्युदास or between पर्युदास and उपसंहार, is very useful for interpreting negative sentences in literature in general, and Sanskrit literature in particular. Although the मीमांसक lay more stress on the potential form (विधिलिङ्) of verbs in this respect, the principles of विधि and निषेध may generally be made applicable to the verbs in the indicative mood also.

The fifth and last division of the Veda is अर्थवाद (explanatory or supplementary statement) which praises a thing laid down by a विधि and censures a thing prohibited by a निषेध. Although the अर्थवादs in the ब्राह्मणs consist of lengthy and imaginary stories, legends, etc., and sometimes contain descriptions of impossible or fanciful things, they are not meaningless. For, instead of understanding them in their literal or primary sense, we have to interpret them by resorting to implication (लक्षणा). Being taken in its *implied sense an* अर्थवाद *is connected with the* शाब्दी-भावना *(verbal energy) in a* विधि or निषेध, and *praising or censuring a thing contained in either of them, it expresses* the manner of *performance* (इतिकर्तव्यता) of a rite. The अर्थवाद thus becomes meaningful when it forms a syntactical whole (एकवाक्यता) with the विधि or निषेध laid down in the Veda. For instance, 'वायुर्वै क्षेपिष्ठा देवता' (वायु is indeed the swiftest deity) is an अर्थवाद, the purpose of which is not merely to denote its own primary sense, but to become meaningful by praising the thing enjoined in the विधि 'वायव्यं श्वेतमालभेत भूतिकामः' (One desirous of prosperity should sacrifice a white animal to वायु), and by subordinately forming a syntactical whole with that विधि which is principal. The अर्थवादs implying censure, of course, form a syntactical whole with a निषेध. As thus अर्थवादs indirectly impel a man to perform an action stated in a विधि, or turn him away from

thing prohibited in a निषेध, they are more connected with the शाब्दी भावना than with the आर्थी भावना.

अर्थवाद is of three kinds: गुणवाद (a figurative statement), अनुवाद (a corroborative statement) and भूतार्थवाद (a statement of the past).

(i) गुणवाद, taken in its primary sense, contradicts some other means of proof; but, understood in its secondary or figurative sense, it implies similarity or identity of a *quality*. In the sentence 'आदित्यो यूपः' (The sacrificial post is the sun) the identity between 'आदित्य' and 'यूप' contradicts Perception (प्रत्यक्षप्रमाण); yet both of them are said to be identical on account of the common quality of 'brightness'. The sense of the sentence is that the sacrificial post is as bright as the sun; and this sense is obtained by adopting लक्षणा (implication).

(ii) अनुवाद reiterates or corroborates what is already existing or what is ascertained by other means of proof like Perception. The sentence 'अग्निर्हिमस्य भेषजम्' (Fire is an antidote against cold) is in praise of अग्नि; yet, it is the statement of an already existing fact that fire protects us from cold.

(iii) भूतार्थवाद neither contradicts other means of proof nor corroborates them, but simply states what is said to have taken place in the past. The sentence 'इन्द्रो वृत्राय वज्रमुदयच्छत्' (इन्द्र lifted his thunderbolt against वृत्र) is an instance of this variety.

An अर्थवाद may comprise a sentence or passage in the form of a story, description, allegory, etc.; yet it is always to be formed into a synthetic whole with the विधि. The wider meaning of this principle may be understood that subordinate parts of a sentence or passage in literature and शास्त्र are always to be unified with the main sentence or idea of an author. As in such sentences or main ideas the *intention* or *purport* of an author (वक्तृतात्पर्य) is centred, the various concrete, illustrative, artistic and persuasive ways of expression adopted by him to arrive at the main idea should, in interpretation, be naturally construed with his purport, so that the synthetic meaning of that author would be clearly grasped. It *is noteworthy here that in consonance with the principle of* अर्थवाद *the* अभिहितान्वय *school of* the मीमांसा, with this synthetic purpose in view, emphasizes the तात्पर्यवृत्ति, which will be dealt with later on

We have so far given a summary of the most important *principles of interpretation* propounded by the मीमांसक, leaving all the minute details. Those principles have been summarized here in such a manner that they might be seen in their proper perspective and their importance from a new point of view might be realized. There is, of course, twofold purpose in giving this summary. The first purpose is to show how the मीमांसक too in their particular science *have followed the general principles of methodology.* In other words, it is

shown here how the मीमासक्स determine *the subordinate and principal elements* of their cult, how they exhibit *distinctness and unity of purpose* (i e धर्म), how they unite the subordinate and principal elements with that purpose and how they organize *all the elements into a synthetic whole or a system* In this process they first classify their subject-matter into minor and major parts and then develop it into a synthetic whole As thus the methodology of the मीमासक्स is *analytico-synthetic* like that of the other शास्त्रs, it evidently deserves a prominent place in the survey of general methodology The second purpose is to present in a nutshell the principles of interpretation belonging to the मीमासक्स, as they have substantially contributed to the general linguistics and merit wider application It is actually found that almost all the above laws of interpretation, particularly those of विनियोगविधि, निषेध, नियम, परिसङ्ख्या and अर्थवाद, which lay due *strees on the sentence-aspect of language* i e, which make individual words subordinate to a sentence, have been *widely adopted by the* शास्त्रs *like* व्याकरण, साहित्य, वेदान्त, धर्मशास्त्र etc Those laws of interpretation which are the best parts of the मीमासा are, therefore, of permanent value and are worthy of preservation Particularly, when we take into account the nature of Sanskrit language, as formerly dealt with, we can realize the utility and importance of those principles in the matter of the *scientific and synthetic exposi-*

tion of sentences in language. We have also shown above at different places how those principles, looked at from a new point of view, supply a sound *basis for language teaching;* and in this respect they compare favourably with the *Western principles of the study and teaching of language.* It has been again shown how the मीमांसा principles of methodology apply in a more or less degree to the science of teaching in general and language-teaching in particular. Other linguistic implications of those principles will again be brought out in detail later on at different places according as there is an occasion for their exposition. Suffice it to say here that in union with the theories of the न्याय about प्रमाण (means of proof) and those of the व्याकरण about पद (a word), those of the मीमांसक about वाक्य (a sentence) give a completely scientific turn to the methods of expounding literature and शास्त्र.

VII. THE COMPARATIVE METHOD.

Employment of the theories of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण in the scientific exposition of शास्त्र and literature necessarily presupposes a comparative study of the व्याकरण, the मीमांसा, and the न्याय, the sciences of general interest and application; and this will vouch for the existence of comparative, critical and scientific

Naturally the Shastris who study the व्याकरण, the मीमांसा, the न्याय, the वेदान्त, the साहित्य, etc, are fully conversant with all those methods relating to पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण, and the denial of these actual facts is a misrepresentation of truth We must, however, be alive to the fact that some Shastris study only one of those शास्त्र and resort to narrow specialization, in which there is little scope for the Comparative Method Yet generally speaking, many Shastris, having recourse to wider specialization, can be found even up to the present day This wider specialization, which is very desirable according to the modern tendency in education, prompts a student to know everything of a few allied subjects and something of other distantly related ones It can, therefore, be asserted that this modern tendency was not only prevalent in ancient India, but is still observable in the Shastri methods of teaching the शास्त्र and literature.

VIII THE SYNTHETIC METHOD. THE METHODS OF THE वेदान्त.

The most eminent of all the versatile luminaries of ancient India is शङ्कराचार्य, who with a comparative outlook first realized the importance of amalgamating the principles of पद (व्याकरण), वाक्य (पूर्वमीमांसा) and प्रमाण (न्याय) for the exposition of the वेदान्त

philosophy, and who is, therefore, aptly called 'पदवाक्यप्रमाणपारावारपारीण'. He has enriched Sanskrit language with his substantial contribution to the *rational or scientific exposition of the Vedic literature in general and of the Upanishadic philosophy in particular,* and has immensely influenced later authors It is, therefore, essential to observe the noteworthy features of the methods of explaining the Upanishadic sentences and the worldly phenomena, as employed by him. We have to limit this treatment to the observation of his methodology rather than to a connected and detailed exposition of his philosophical thought, which will, of course, be taken into account incidentally so as to shed light on his methodology शङ्कराचार्य, doubtless, admits that the principles of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण are conducive to a systematic and graded exposition of the वेदान्त, yet he never forgets that they are relatively subordinate to the Transcendental Reality and intuitional realization (*अनुभव*) *of the Highest Self* (*ब्रह्मन्, परमात्मन्*) *with Whom* the Individual Self (जीवात्मन्) is intrinsically identical. He, therefore, saw with penetrating insight that the main purport (तात्पर्य) of the Upanishadic sentences was identity (ऐक्य) or non-duality (अद्वैत) of the Indiv'dual Self and the Universal Self This main purport of non-duality is corroborated by the Upanishads themselves in the four महावाक्यs of the four Vedas, viz, 'प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म' (Brahman is pure Intelligence), 'अहं ब्रह्मास्मि' (I am Brahman), 'तत्त्वमसि'

Reality of परमात्मन्. They are, therefore, very valuable for one who is earnestly proceeding on the path to Self-Realization. Hence शङ्कराचार्य thinks that along with श्रुति the intuition (अनुभव) of the Seers of Truth too is authoritative He, however, does not discard the Logical Method, which should be followed, according to him, without contradiction to the purport of श्रुति. It may be remarked here that few philosophers in India have resorted to the logical method to the extent to which शङ्कराचार्य has resorted to it The fact that many sentences in his भाष्य can be easily transformed into syllogisms testifies to his prominent use of the Logical Method, which he employs while refuting his opponents and convincing them of his conclusions also Yet he fully recognizes the limitations of the Logical Method or Reasoning in transcendental matters, where श्रुति must be the final authority. Mere reasoning without the help of श्रुति leads us nowhere, since one reasoning is falsified by another, and this process continues *ad infinitum* in the absence of any realization of Truth He, therefore, concludes that Reasoning, which is supported by श्रुति and helps its interpretation, should be adopted in the वेदान्त As reasoning is useful only on the empirical plane (व्यावहारिक सत्ता), and as in consonance with श्रुति it gradually leads us to the Absolute State (पारमार्थिक सत्ता), the Logical Method without being opposed to Transcendental Experience subserves it. शङ्कराचार्य thus harmonizes Reasoning (तर्क, युक्ति),

with श्रुति and intuition (अनुभव) of Seers.* It should be remembered that we see through ignorance (अविद्या, माया) the duality of names and forms of the phenomenal world on the substratum (अधिष्ठान) of the non-dual ब्रह्मन्. As the function of all the above प्रमाणs including the श्रुति is to dispel that ignorance and indirectly to lead an aspirant by the maxim of 'शाखाचन्द्र' (the moon on the branch) to the self-luminous ब्रह्मन्, they are relatively authoritative on the empirical plane only. The प्रमाणs cannot directly point out the ब्रह्मन् but suggest its all-pervading presence by means of लक्षणा (Implication). As soon as they dispel ignorance, the self-luminous ब्रह्मन् manifests itself as one Ultimate Reality, and the function and authority *of the प्रमाणs are over. Here the false ignorance* is removed by the प्रमाणs which are false from the Absolute point of view, and then ब्रह्मन् is realized as ever-present. For, the removal of darkness is itself the attainment of light. Maintaining this position about the प्रमाणs शङ्कराचार्य makes use

---

* वाक्यार्थविचारणाध्यवसाननिर्वृत्ता हि ब्रह्मावगतिर्नानुमानादिप्रमाणान्तरनिर्वृत्ता । सत्सु तु वेदान्तवाक्येषु जगतो जन्मादिकारणवादिषु तदर्थग्रहणदार्ढ्यायानुमानमपि वेदान्तवाक्याविरोधि प्रमाणं भवन्न निवार्यते, श्रुत्यैव च सहायत्वेन तर्कस्याभ्युपेतत्वात् ।...न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायां, किन्तु श्रुत्यादयोऽनुभवादयश्च यथासम्भवमिह प्रमाणम्, अनुभवावसानत्वाद् भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य ।

—ब्र. सू. भाष्यम्, १.१.२.

world Again, instead of being opposed to the modern scientific inventions, which contribute to the worldly prosperity (अभ्युदय), शङ्कराचार्य's system affords *full scope for them on the phenomenal plane*, if they do not lead us astray to the destruction of humanity through exploitation and aggression, and if they do not delude us as to the main human goal, which is the Realization of the Self (निःश्रेयस). On the other hand, every such invention, past or future, is a new addition of names and forms (नामरूप) to the former ones, and demonstrates the truth that all this diversity emanates from Unity, which is defined by the वेदान्त as 'the intelligent cause of this universe'

As said above, the *Upanishads* contain descriptions of the creation and dissolution of the universe, and it is stated in them that ब्रह्मन् is the intelligent cause of the creation sustenance and dissolution of the universe in Itself The sentences 'यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते०' (तैत्ति० ३।१)–'From whom these beings are born, etc', 'सर्वकर्मा सर्वकाम सर्वगन्ध' सर्वरस' (छा० ३।१४।२)–'From whom all actions' *desires, smells and flavours emanate,' etc*, 'give us an idea of the relative or qualified (अपर, सगुण) ब्रह्मन् On the other hand, there are Upanishadic sentences which merely indicate the true nature of ब्रह्मन्, as, 'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' (तै० २।१)–'ब्रह्मन् is pure Existence Intelligence and Infinity,' or those which negate all attributes of ब्रह्मन्, as, 'अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययम्' (कठ.३।१५)–'Which is without sound, touch, form and

decay'. These latter sentences in the Upanishads tell that there is no relativity in ब्रह्मन्, but that ब्रह्मन् is Absolute or unqualified. शङ्कराचार्य, on the basis of such sentences and of the ब्रह्मसूत्र (३।२।११-२१), says from the synthetic point of view that the श्रुति makes this distinction simply for the sake of leading an aspirant from the first to the second by gradual stages, and does not mean that the सगुणब्रह्मन् is the ultimate reality.* The harmony between such two sets of श्रुति can be established by the hypothesis of Nescience or माया. That is to say, the निर्गुण ब्रह्मन् becomes सगुण ब्रह्मन् or ईश्वर on account of the limiting adjunct (उपाधि) of Nescience or माया, which is the incomprehensible power of ब्रह्मन् Itself, and which, without really being an entity separate from ब्रह्मन्, is supposed to be different from it. This *Nescience, illuminated by the self-luminous* ब्रह्मन्, shows us the imaginary world of names and forms. In other words, ब्रह्मन् *being associated with the limiting adjunct of Nescience is said to be the cause of the creation of the world, just as the rope associated with the ignorance relating to it is said to create the imaginary snake on it.* Thus the world is falsely created, sustained and dissolved by the सगुण ब्रह्मन् or ईश्वर in Himself, just as the snake is

* भेदस्योपासनार्थत्वादभेदे तात्पर्यात्। (ब्र. सू. भा. ३।२।१२)
तस्मादेवंजातीयकेषु वाक्येषु यथाश्रुतं निराकारमेव ब्रह्मावधारयितव्यम्। इतराणि त्वाकारवद्ब्रह्मविषयाणि वाक्यानि न तत्प्रधानानि। उपासनाविधिप्रधानानि हि तानि। ब्र. सू. भा. ३।२।१४.

falsely created, sustained and dissolved in itself by the rope As then the creation, sustenance and dissolution of the world are merely a false appearance or magic transformation (विवर्त) on the substratum of ब्रह्मन्, the causality of ब्रह्मन् and Its name 'ईश्वर', 'सगुण', etc, are relatively true as long as the worldly phenomena appear, and not Its true nature Its true nature is, therefore, 'सत्य ज्ञानमनन्त ब्रह्म' or that which negates all attributes The definition, wherein ब्रह्मन् is relatively described as the imaginary cause of the world, is called 'तटस्थ लक्षण', and the definition, wherein Its true nature is indicated, is called 'स्वरूपलक्षण'.

As ब्रह्मन्, through the agency of माया, becomes the imaginary cause of creation, so it is also the cause of the dissolution of the world in Itself It is, therefore, both the efficient cause (निमित्तकारण) and the material cause (उपादानकारण) of the universe, just like the spider sending forth and drawing in its threads † Since ब्रह्मन् appears to be the world to ignorant people by magic transformation (विवर्त), and not by actual transformation (परिणाम), the view of शङ्कराचार्य about causation is different from the परिणामवाद of the साङ्ख्यs, who accept the non-intelligent Primeval Matter (प्रकृति) as the cause and the intelligent पुरुष as different from it The theory of विवर्त differs also from the आरम्भवाद of the न्यायवैशषिकs who accept God as only the efficient cause and the infinitesimal

† यथोर्णनाभि सृजते गृह्णते च ।—मु १ १ ७.

atoms, which are *different from God, as the material* cause. Now if it is supposed that actual transformation (परिणाम) of ब्रह्मन् takes place, the immutability of the Intelligent ब्रह्मन् described by the श्रुति would be falsified, and none would seek to attain It as the eternal Bliss of the Self.

It is noteworthy that the Causal Relation postulated in every science other than the वेदान्त is based upon the distinction of cause and effect. The cause is defined as 'an invariable, unconditional and immediate antecedent of a phenomenon.' But there the 'invariability' etc. of the cause, without being actually and definitely perceived, rests on our belief in 'probability'; and even a single fact coming forth as contradictory to that probability frustrates that causation. There is, really speaking, no line of demarcation where the causal state ceases *and where the effect begins to appear.* In most [illegible] ible but is only [illegible] though for the [illegible] ke the cause to be different from the effect, yet the cause and the effect in their *true essence* are not different. They are merely names and forms attributed to the same *eternal essence.* The worldly phenomenon is then a beginningless flux of 'names and forms' where the antecedence of the cause and the sequence of the effect cannot be settled; and the change that appears *to take place* and *that makes us employ* the words 'cause and effect' is not at all a change in the inner essence, which is the eternal Existence,

Intelligence and Infinity (सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तम्), but is a change only in names and forms imagined by our mind. This is the reason why शङ्कराचार्य adopts the अनिर्वचनीयख्याति (Theory of inexplicability) or the विवर्तवाद (Theory of illusory transformation) in order to account for the phenomena of the universe; and he accepts the causality of ब्रह्मन् through 'विवर्त' and that of माया associated with It through परिणाम. It is here interesting to note that the modern scientists cannot definitely explain the relation* between electrons and protons, and are gradually being led to rest on 'अनिर्वचनीयता' (inexplicability). It may, therefore, be said that they are ceasing to be Materialists, that the causal relation of things, experimental work, scientific method, induction, etc, are relatively true from the phenomenal standpoint, and that all theories attempting to explain the phenomena of the universe are provisional or relative,-true in the व्यावहारिक सत्ता only. Time and space which are the basis of the causal relation and several provisional theories are merely the subjective musings of the mind Although the विवर्तवाद, postulated by शङ्कराचार्य for explaining the creation and dissolution of the world, as described in the Upanishads, is such a provisional theory, *it serves best its purpose of leading the aspirant to the Ultimate Reality of the Absolute* According to this theory the effect is not different from the cause, and hence the world of names and forms which falsely appears in manifold ways upon the unaffected ब्रह्मन्, its sub-

stratum, is not different from ब्रह्म, just as the snake on the rope is not different from the rope, or the dream-world is not different from the dreaming person.

The world is then an illusion, not in the sense that it is the void (शून्य) or non-entity of the Buddhists, but in the sense that it has no existence independently of ब्रह्म, which is Existence, Intelligence and Infinity. It should be particularly noted that शङ्कराचार्य does not deny the reality of the world on the phenomenal plane. What he means is that the world is relatively real as long as our senses and mind operate, or as long as the cosmic ignorance (समष्टि अज्ञान = माया), which gives rise to it is not removed by the superconsciousness of Absolute Reality, just as a dream is real as long as we have not attained wakefulness. As in the case of the snake appearing on the rope we cannot say whether it exists or does not exist, so in the case of the world too we cannot say whether it exists or does not exist. Since the world is neither existent nor non-existent (सदसद्विलक्षण), we have to conclude that it is inexplicable (अनिर्वचनीय). The existence or reality of the world does not belong to itself, but belongs to ब्रह्म, just as the reality of the snake does not belong to itself but belongs to the rope. This is what शङ्कराचार्य means by the words 'माया' and 'मिथ्या' which do not mean 'शून्य' (void, nothing). It must be remembered that an illusory phenomenon appears only on *a positive basis* and not on a

negative non-entity So the illusory world appears to be real (relatively) on the substratum of the ever-existent ब्रह्मन् Again, as the relation between the world and ब्रह्मन् cannot be explained either by संयोग (conjunction) or by समवाय (inherence), it has to be concluded that it is due to the Superimposition (अध्यास) caused by Nescience.

It should not be supposed that the theory of माया and that of Superimposition (अध्यास) arising from it are शङ्कराचार्य's own fabrications For references to माया, express,$ implied† or through the use of the word 'अविद्या'§ can be found in the Upanishads as well as in the ब्रह्मसूत्रs In the ऋग्वेद the word 'माया' is used in the sense of 'a wondrous or supernatural power', and in the नासदीयसूक्त (ऋ X. 129) the idea of 'अनिर्वचनीयता' (inexplicability) is found embedded In the अथर्ववेद the word 'माया' is used in the sense of 'magic,' which further develops into the sense of 'illusion' गौडपादाचार्य, the great Guru of शङ्कराचार्य makes repeated references to 'माया' in the sense of 'illusion in his माण्डूक्य कारिका What शङ्कराचार्य did was that on the basis of these data he *synthesized the idea of माया and gave a systematic exposition of it*

$ बृह० २।५।१९, प्रश्न० १।१६, श्वेता. १।१० and ४।९–१०; ब्रह्मसूत्र ३।२।३

† बृ० २।४।१४, ३।४।२, ४।४।१९, छा० ६।१।४, ७।२४।१, ८।३।१–२, कठ० ४।१०, ब्र० सू० २।१।१४, २।१।२८.

§ बृ० ४।४।४, कठ० २।४–५, मु० १।२।८, २।१।१०, छा० १।१।१०.

This idea can also be corroborated by quoting the empirical experience of every being. Just as every human being says 'I know', so he also says 'I do not know' (अहमज्ञः, न किञ्चिद्वेदिषम्). This empirical experience of 'knowing' is the indication of the fact that every being is of the nature of pure Intelligence or Knowledge (चित्स्वरूप); *while the experience* of 'not knowing', which is somehow associated with 'knowing', and which is *really illuminated by pure Intelligence,* is the indication of the fact that he is possessed of innate Ignorance. This Ignorance *looked at from the individual* (व्यष्टि) *point of view* is called 'अविद्या' and from the collective (समष्टि) point of view it is called 'माया' or Cosmic Ignorance. This Ignorance or Nescience makes us superimpose the body, the mind, etc, upon our inward Intelligence and designate it as 'the individual, the knower or the subject' (जीव, प्रमाता, विषयी). It again makes us superimpose the whole world of names and forms on the external all pervading Intelligence and call it 'the universe, the known or the object' (जगत्, प्रमेय, विषय). Further the subject and his attributes are superimposed on the object and its attributes, or the object on the subject; and thus the Real and the Unreal are coupled together through this inherent Ignorance. The fact, however, is that the pure Intelligence (चित्), *internal* and external, or individual and universal, is Unity without a gap. For, no means of knowledge (प्रमाण) can connect itself with the *knower* (प्रमाता) and the

known (प्रमेय) unless all are *essentially one,* though *they appear to be different from one another* on account of illusory limiting adjuncts (उपाधि). Really speaking, *the same eternal Intelligence* (चित्, संविद्) is, as it were, divided into three modes, viz, प्रमाता, प्रमाणं and प्रमेय by the process of Superimposition (अध्यास). This superimposition is defined by शङ्कराचार्य as, "the false perception, in the form of recollection, of a thing previously seen, in another thing",* or "the supposition of a thing in another thing where it does not exist" † While giving this definition of Superimposition शङ्कराचार्य quotes, on the same, the views of other systems of philosophy, viz, the अन्यथाख्यातिवादिन्s or नैयायिकs and भाट्टमीमांसकs, the आत्मख्यातिवादिन्s or विज्ञानवादी बौद्धs, the अख्यातिवादिन्s or प्राभाकरमीमांसकs and the असत्ख्यातिवादिन्s or शून्यवादी बौद्धs It will be particularly noted that शङ्कराचार्य here finds with a *comparative and synthetic outlook* the common feature of all those views, and says that all these systems agree in respect of holding Superimposition to be the assumption of the attributes of one thing in another thing § He himself resorts, however, to the विवर्तवाद or अनिर्वचनीयख्याति, which is so called because we cannot explain *how* this phenomenon takes place.

---

* आह–कोऽयमध्यासो नामेति । उच्यते–स्मृतिरूपः परत्र पूर्वदृष्टावभासः । (अध्यासभाष्य).

† अध्यासो नाम अतस्मिंस्तद्बुद्धिः । (अ. भा.)

§ सर्वथापि त्वन्यस्यान्यधर्मावभासतां न व्यभिचरति । (अ. भा.)

It will be noted that शङ्कराचार्य adopts the विवर्त्त वाद् according to the maxim of 'अध्यारोपापवाद' $ or the method of assumption and negation The world is first assumed to exist and then negated, as the snake is assumed to exist on the rope and then negated. Strictly speaking, this विवर्तवाद naturally culminates in the अजातिवाद of गौडपादाचार्य For, false creation or dissolution of the world is equivalent to no creation or dissolution, as the false assumption or negation of the snake on the rope means that the snake is never born or destroyed The Nescience, the विवर्त or अध्यास resulting from Nescience, and the duality of the world are, however, postulated, like the hypothesis in geometry, according to the ordinary experience or crude understanding of ignorant pupils, simply for the purpose of gradually leading them to the Highest Unity of परमात्मन्. This method of teaching is strictly in accordance with the कारिकाs of गौडपाद, who purports that the assumed duality of the teacher, the taught and the शास्त्र is simply for the purpose of 'instruction', and that it disappears when the Highest Reality is known § Again, गौडपाद says that the separateness of the Individual Soul and the Universal Soul is only secondary and not primary, for, it is assumed after

$ Read the following verse– "इत्युक्त्वाभिमुखीकृत्य शिष्यं करुणया गुरु । अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्चयन् ॥२९५॥
(सर्ववेदान्तसिद्धान्तसारसङ्ग्रह)

§ उपदेशादयं वादो ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते । माण्डूक्यकारिका, १।१८.

separate entity (i e the world), and in which there is the Absolute Rest of परमात्मन्, as it is in deep sleep (सुषुप्ति) *These three grades have been* postulated by शङ्कराचार्य in order that the aspirant should reach the highest goal through graded steps In the अद्वैतवेदान्त the दृष्टिसृष्टिवाद (Absolute or Pure Idealism) is the foremost theory, which propounds that the universe is not apart from the sight (Intelligence) of the Seer, or that it is pure Intelligence (संविद्), *and which is, therefore, meant* for the advanced people of the प्रातिभासिक and पारमार्थिक states The main point to be noted here is that *extraordinary synthetic power, logical acumen and wider outlook* have been exhibited by शङ्कराचार्य in propounding the विवर्तवाद and in giving an *analytico-synthetic interpretation of the Upanishads* *

---

* 'The task of reducing the teaching of the whole of the Upanishads to a system consistent and free from contradictions is an intrinsically impossible one But the task once being given, we are quite ready to admit that Sankara s system is most probably the best which can be devised We yet acknowledge that the adoption of that distinction (of a lower and higher Brahman) furnishes the interpreter with an instrument of extraordinary power for reducing to an orderly whole the heterogeneous material presented by the old theosophic treatises Sankara s method thus enables him in a certain way to do justice to different stages of h storical development to recognise clearly existing differences which other systemat sers are intent on obliterating It (Sankara's system) is not only more pliable more capable of amalgamating heterogeneous material

It has been shown above that the व्यावहारिक सत्ता, प्रातिभासिक सत्ता and पारमार्थिक सत्ता broadly correspond to the three states of the Individual Soul, viz., जाग्रत्, स्वप्न and सुषुप्ति. All human activities, physical as well as intellectual, ordinary as well as scientific, proceed only in the consciousness of जाग्रत्, and the reality of the phenomenal world is perceived only in the जाग्रत्. But to lay undue stress on this जाग्रत् and to call the world 'real' from the stand-point of जाग्रत् is only a partial appoach to Truth, which is, therefore, bound to remain 'relative.' Unless the experiences of all those three states are *analysed*, and unless the unbroken (अखण्ड) presence of One Seer or Witness (साक्षिन्) of the three states is *synthetically* realized, there can be no complete approach to the Absolute Truth Every one of those three states being evanescent is annulled by the other, so that when one state is present, the other is absent, while the साक्षिन्, who illumines and unifies all their conscious as well as unconscious experiences and yet remains untouched by them, is one and the same. The assumption of the existence of those three states, therefore, involves अध्यारोप, and the negation of them so as to approach the ever-present साक्षिन् involves अपवाद. In other words, the

than other systems, but its fundamental doctrines are manifestly in greater harmony with the essential teaching of the Upanishads than those of other Vedantic systems

—G. Thibaut-Introduction to the Vedanta-Sutras, pp. CXXII–CXXIV.

examination of all the three states and their negation is the process of *Analysis*, while the realization of one साक्षिन् everywhere is the process of *Synthesis.* The whole method here employed may then be called the *Analytico-Synthetic Method,* which being throughly scientific deserves to be employed as the complete method even by the modern *mental sciences in their search for Truth.* Although this method is called 'अन्वयव्यतिरेक' in the वेदान्त system, it somewhat differs from the 'अन्वयव्यतिरेक' of the नैयायिकs, as the latter is applied only to the experiences of the जाग्रत्-state and takes the world to be a real entity. The 'अन्वयव्यतिरेक' method of the वेदान्त, on the other hand, is applied not only to जाग्रत् but to स्वप्न and सुषुप्ति also, for demonstrating their reciprocal absence and negation (व्यतिरेक) and for realizing the all-pervading presence(अन्वय) of साक्षिन्. As then this method of अन्वयव्यतिरेक is applied, to the *whole human experience,* conscious as well as unconscious, its employment for the examination of the three states (जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्ति) and realization of साक्षिन् is *the fundamental topic of the* वेदान्त *philosophy.*

This most important topic has received very subtle exposition in several Upanishads, † the माण्डूक्यकारिकाs and the भाष्यs of शङ्कराचार्य. The method of अन्वय (Inclusion, Synthesis) is employed by the

† कठ. ४।४; छान्दोग्य ६।८–११; बृह. २।१।१५–२०, २।५।१-१५, ४।२।३, ४।३।१–३८, कौषीतकि. ३।३.

Upanishads in affirmative sentences like 'सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म' (छां. ३।१४।१)–(All this is Brahman), or in those that describe the all-pervading presence of ब्रह्मन् in all names and forms (बृ. २।५।६–११); while the method of व्यतिरेक (*Exclusion, Negation, Analysis*) is used in negative sentences like 'नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन' (बृ. ४।४।१९)–[There is no duality of any sort here], 'नेति नेति' (बृ. २।३।६)–[Not this, not this], 'अन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितादधि' (केन. १।३)–[It is distinct from the known and above the unknown], 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह' (तै. २।४।१)–[From Whom words and the mind turn away without reaching Him], etc.

उद्दालक आरुणि in his advice to श्वेतकेतु (छां. ६।८–११) repeats the महावाक्य 'तत्त्वमसि' [Thou (जीव) art That (ईश्वर)] several times after quoting various familiar illustrations. It is worthy of note that he cites the experiences of deep sleep, dream and wakefulness in order to expound the identity of जीव and ईश्वर. In the अद्वैतवेदान्त 'ईश्वर' technically means Existence (सत्), Intelligence (चित्), and Bliss (आनन्द), the Self of all creatures, when It is associated with the limiting adjunct (उपाधि) of cosmic ignorance (समष्टि अज्ञान–माया) in deep sleep or before the creation of the world. In deep sleep all creatures (जीव) setting aside their Individuality are really united with 'सत्', their own Self. Although this 'सत्' or Intelligent Seer illumines the collective ignorance (समष्टि अज्ञान) of all creatures, He, being as it were limited by that ignorance, is called 'ईश्वर'. On

the other hand, Individuality (जीवत्व) is distinctly felt by all creatures in wakefulness, which too is *illumined individually by the same Intelligent Seer,* who is then, as it were, limited by the individual ignorance of every creature and is called 'जीव'. As every जीव of the wakeful state can recollect the identical experience of the 'ईश्वर' of deep sleep in the form of a sentence like 'I slept very happily, I then knew nothing' (सुखमहमस्वाप्सं, न किञ्चिदवेदिषम्), he must be identical with ईश्वर, since *one who experiences* and one who *recollects* that experience are bound to be *identical* The identity *of* जीव *and* ईश्वर *is established by the following* methods :

First, the limiting adjuncts of जीव and ईश्वर (i e व्यष्टि अज्ञान, समष्टि अज्ञान, etc) are eliminated by the method of negation (व्यतिरेक) or जहल्लक्षणा (Exclusive Implication) which is then supplemented by the method of अन्वय (synthesis) or अजहल्लक्षणा (Inclusive Implication) enabling us to realize the *inner presence of the common underlying Intelligence* Thus it will be seen that *the combination of* व्यतिरेक *and* अन्वय *or the analytico*-synthetic method leads us to the *unifying Inner* Self of us all *In the Upanishads,* in the भाष्य of शङ्कराचार्य and in later Sanskrit works, however, *a major portion is occupied by the* व्यतिरेक *method rather than by the* अन्वय *method* This is quite in accordance with the crude understanding of ignorant people, who are not expected to realize the full significance of

अन्वय, unless their Nescience is completely dispelled by the *repeated employment* of the व्यतिरेक method.

व्यतिरेक or *negation* of the world is then the negation of apparent names and forms *only* and *not of the Inner Essence* Use of Logic too is made in this method of व्यतिरेक for analysing the empirical experiences of the three states But *this logical* analysis, though it places the वेदान्त system on a rational basis, is always supplemented by the authority of श्रुति. This logical analysis can do its utmost only in the elimination of duality For, *the self-luminous Inner Self, the substratum of all duality, cannot further be analysed or negated* The Upanishad says, "येनेद् विज्ञानाति त केन विजानीयात् । विज्ञातारमरे केन विजानीयात्" (बृ ४।५।१५)—[Through what should one know Him by Whom one knows all this? Through what should one know the Knower?] This Knower (विज्ञाता) is the Self who inspires us to establish the synthesis (अन्वय) of all It need not here be supposed that when every name and form of the world is negated, what remains is only 'the void or nothing' (शून्य) of the Buddhists For, that '*void or nothing*' *cannot be thought of unless it is illumined by the Eternal Seer* who is not non-existent even in the absence of words *

---

* In connection with the method of अन्वयव्यतिरेक the following verses from the पञ्चदशी of विद्यारण्य may be read — अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्या पञ्चकोशविवेकत । स्वात्मान तत उद्धृत्य पर ब्रह्म प्रपद्यते ॥ १।३७ ॥ पञ्चकोशपरित्यागे साक्षिबोधावशेषत । स्वस्वरूप स

This indescribable Eternal Seer, from the standpoint of अन्वय, reveals Himself in the form of time, space, science, art, literature, religion, etc, and the knowledge of this Seer can establish *the higher synthesis of all dualistic systems of thought,* even though they are in conflict with one another. गौडपादाचार्य significantly says—

परस्पर विरुध्यन्ते तैरय न विरुध्यते ।
माण्डूक्यकारिका, ३।१७.

" The dualists oppose one another, the Adwaitin, however, does not conflict with them "

In the भाष्य on this कारिका, शङ्कराचार्य eloquently and nobly says " *Our system which establishes* the unity of आत्मन् and which is based upon the श्रुति, does not conflict with those mutually conflicting systems, on account of our inner identity with them all, just as one cannot conflict with one's own hands and feet " † This is why शङ्कराचार्य accepts good points from all Indian systems and assigns to them a proper place in the wider scheme of his *analytico-synthetic meth dology.*

एव स्याच्छून्यत्व तस्य दुर्घटम् ॥ ३।२२ ॥ अत एव श्रुतिर्बोध्य बाधित्वा-शेषयत्यद । स एष नेति नेत्यात्मेत्यतद्व्यावृत्तिरूपत ॥ ३।३२ ॥ अतद्व्यावृत्तिरूपेण साक्षाद्विधिमुखेन च । वेदान्ताना प्रवृत्ति स्याद् द्विधेत्याचार्यभाषितम् ॥ ७।८७ ॥ विविच्यता भोक्तृतत्त्व जाग्रदादिष्वसङ्गता । अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्या साक्षिण्यध्यवसीयते ॥ ७।२१० ॥

† तैरन्योन्यविरोधिभिरस्मदीयोऽय वैदिक. सर्वानन्यत्वादात्मैकत्वदर्शनपक्षो न विरुध्यते, यथा स्वहस्तपादादिभि । माण्डूक्यभाष्य, ३।१७.

Thus शङ्कराचार्य accepts the *grammatical method* of dealing with words (पद), though he refutes the स्फोट of the वैयाकरणs; he adopts the मीमांसा–principles of interpreting Vedic sentences (वाक्य), though he refutes the कर्मवाद of the मीमांसकs and subordinates कर्म to ज्ञान; he sanctions in general the methodology of the न्यायवैशेषिकs and their *theory of* प्रमाणs, though he rejects their आरम्भवाद and ईश्वर as the efficient *cause only; he amalgamates the whole psychology of the* साङ्ख्ययोग *system* with the Adwaita philosophy, though he shatters to pieces the प्रधानकारणवाद of the निरीश्वरसाङ्ख्यs and the two entities, प्रधान and ईश्वर, propounded by the सेश्वरसाङ्ख्यs (योगिन्s)$; and he seems to lend support to the ethics of the बौद्धs and जैनs, though as regards the authority of the Veda and the Ultimate Reality of the universe he refutes their views.§ Since शङ्कराचार्य sees all the followers of those systems as intrinsically *one* with his own Self, he does not regard them as his real opponents. He refutes all of them because the knowledge they deal with and the theories they propound fall only *within the province* of जाग्रत्, which is actuated by the primal Nescience. They do not, therefore, lead human beings to their own real nature (ब्रह्मन्) as aimed at

$ तेनेष्टमेव साङ्ख्ययोगस्मृत्योः बाधकात्वम् । (ब्र. सू. भा. २।१।३).

§ The refutations of all these systems are mostly included in the First अध्याय and the first two पादs of the Second अध्याय in the ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्य.

by the benevolent श्रुति. If it is said that even the वेदान्त philosophy and the विवर्तवाद or other theories put forth in it belong to the province of जाग्रत् actuated by the primal Nescience, शङ्कराचार्य's ready reply is that the case of the वेदान्त philosophy too is really such In other words, it is true that the विवर्तवाद and other theories of the वेदान्त are really provisional He, however, makes one difference here that the other शास्त्रs lead us astray from the Ultimate Reality of ब्रह्मन्, while the वेदान्तशास्त्र which, with its theories like the विवर्तवाद, is based upon the superconscious intuition (अनुभव) of the Seers of ब्रह्मन्, and upon the श्रुति indicating that intuition, is worthy of being studied for the attainment of one's own Highest Bliss † The other शास्त्रs keep us confined to the primal Nescience, while the वेदान्त शास्त्र, though it belongs to the sphere of Nescience, treats of the self-luminous ब्रह्मन् and dispels that Nescience, just as a mere negative word, and not an actual staff, can kill the imaginary snake on the rope, or a weapon belonging to the dream-world alone can kill a lion seen in a dream After fully taking into account this relative nature of the वेदान्तशास्त्र, शङ्कराचार्य has purposely

† तमेतमेवलक्षणमध्यास पण्डिता 'अविद्या' इति मन्यन्ते, तद्विवेकेन च वस्तुस्वरूपावधारण विद्यामाहु । . तमेतमविद्याख्यमात्मानात्मनोरितरेतराध्यास पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारा लौकिका प्रवृत्ता , सर्वाणि च शास्त्राणि विधिप्रतिषेधमोक्षपराणि। अस्यानर्थहेतो प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्वविद्याप्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ता आरभ्यन्ते । —अध्यासभाष्य ।

adopted the विवर्तवाद, and has written all his भाष्य, particularly the ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्य, by interpreting the main purport of the श्रुति in the light of this विवर्तवाद as well as with due attention to the व्यावहारिक सत्ता, which is *suited to the understanding of ordinary people*, and which is, therefore, a plane fit for the instruction of ब्रह्मन्.

शङ्कराचार्य's attitude in regard to the refutation of other systems is as explained above. His usual method of refutation is first to present step by step the पूर्वपक्ष of other systems so faithfully and completely that the reader should be led to regard the पूर्वपक्ष itself as the conclusive view (सिद्धान्त), which is always quite convincing and not refutable. In such a presentation of the पूर्वपक्ष he anticipates all possible objections that may be raised by the opponent, and gives sufficient testimony to his deep *comparative study* of all those systems. After the presentation of the पूर्वपक्ष in this way, he gradually begins to expose flaws and contradictions in the *arguments* of the opponent with subtlety, extraordinary power of argumentation and logical acumen. In his own counter-arguments he employs all logical means of proof (प्रमाण) and plays the role of a skilful lawyer *whose main aim is* merely to beat the other party hollow without giving any clue to his own conclusive view. In such cases the tenets of the Adwaita philosophy *occur only incidentally* and *can be collected or* organized into a constructive philosophy with some

historical sense in them. † Even if it can be said that the Hindus might not have preserved their records of the past unless they had some *historical* sense, it ought to be admitted that they did not possess the 'historical sense' in the modern connotation of that expression The only *ancient* Sanskrit works that partially stand the test of the modern connotation of 'history' are the 'राजतरङ्गिणी of कह्लण, the हर्षचरित of बाण, the विक्रमाङ्कदेवचरित of बिल्हण and the शिवभारत of परमानन्द. We have formerly seen that the पौराणिकs accept 'सम्भव' (probability) and ऐतिह्य (tradition) as separate प्रमाणs If probability be taken to be one of the marks of history, we come somewhat nearer to the modern historical conception For, oral tradition or records of the past which come generally under शब्दप्रमाण (verbal testimony) must agree

† "Nevertheless, one must not believe, as it has so often been asserted, that the historical sense is entirely lacking in Indians In India, too, there has been historical writing, and in any case we find in India numerous accurately dated inscriptions, which could hardly be the case if the Indians had had no sense of history at all. It is only true that the Indians, in their writing of history, never knew how to keep fact and fiction strictly apart, that to them the facts themselves were always more important than their chronological order, and that they attached no importance at all, especially in literary matters, to the questions of what was earlier or later The authors of astronomical books generally also give the exact date of the day on which they completed their work Since the fifth century after Christ, inscriptions too begin to give us *information about the dates of many* authors."

—M. Winternitz–A *History of Indian Literature*, Vol I, Introduction.

with the valid knowledge (प्रमा) gained by प्रत्यक्ष-प्रमाण (Perception). But this does not, of course, include the whole modern sense of 'History', as there are works (Poetry, drama, novels, etc.) which are merely the products of imagination, though they do not contradict perceptual experience and contain 'literary truth' rather than 'historical truth.' The details gained from oral tradition or records must be corroborated by the authentic records (inscriptions, documents, coins, copper-plates, etc.) of *events that have actually taken place* in the past This modern idea of history comprises not only records of political events of the past, but also records of *all human activities*, physical, mental, moral, religious and social, or of the whole civilization of a race on the earth in a *chronological order*.

In history then time and space, on which all the empirical (व्यावहारिक) life of man depends, are the most important factors Philosophically speaking, the truth of history is, therefore, the relative truth of the phenomenal plane (व्यावहारिक सत्ता) and not the absolute truth of Ultimate Reality. As seen formerly, philosophy gives its sanction to the relative truth of the phenomenal plane, since almost all human beings carry on their dealings on the phenomenal plane Hence, history, historical truth and historical method, though they are relative, find their proper place in the ascending scales of truth as recognized by the Hindu philosophy and may seek their development. All this

phenomenal life of names and forms *is a continuous* and changing whole passing through various phases of time and place The six stages of existence (भावविकार) viz, origination, existence, modification, growth, decay and destruction (जायते, अस्ति, विपरिणमते, वर्धते, अपक्षीयत, विनश्यति) are, therefore, applicable to this phenomenal life, and history, which necessarily deals with that life has, of course, *to take into* account all these stages or modifications Time and place are then held to be the causes of those modifications, since the passage of time as much brings about a change in the activities, ideals, customs, etc, of a race as the place or environment in which that race lives *Change of locality and contact with other* races too are factors causing modifications in ideals, activities, etc There is, however, *a substratum of racial character which remains unchanged on account of the particular environment in which a race lives on for ages and that substratum becomes its hereditary property designated as 'Culture'* To trace chronologically all those modifications of human beings in the past as *they have actually taken place, so as to shed light* on the present, is then the task of history' according to the modern conception of that word

If the connected history of a particular race in its proper sequence of particular events is to be written on the basis of all available evidence, oral and written, the historian has to undergo a special kind of mental discipline, which becomes the historical method in its wider application Always aiming

at the historical truth the historian, irrespective of the distinction between the conquerors and the conquered, will have to employ Logic for differentiating the authentic from the spurious sources and history from legend In other words, the verbal testimony (tradition and records) will have to be judged in the light of प्रत्यक्षप्रमाण (Direct perception) and अनुमानप्रमाण (Inference) in order to ascertain the high probability (सम्भव) of an event This is the place where the Historical Method will be amalgamated with the Critical Method If any source is found to contradict those two means of valid knowledge, it will have to be rejected The authentic and internal sources, i e , actual documents, inscriptions, letters etc , of a particular period will be valued more than external sources referred to in the general literature of a country, as they are of the nature of an indirect or circumstantial evidence Even actual documents will lose their value as authentic sources, if they are found, by judgment and other sources to favour a particular party of the period by deprecating the other. In this case the internal evidence will have to be supplemented by the external one It always happens that in the case of scanty internal evidence gaps in history have inevitably to be filled in by external evidence But under no circumstances will the historian make an assertion that is not based on some authentic source Unfortunately historical investigations do not always result in the certainty of a particular event, but at most give the indications of its high probability.

Mohammedan travellers, and the fixed dates of Buddha, Chandra Gupta, Ashoka, etc. It is thus found that archaeology, epigraphy, etc., form the branches of historical investigation, and all of them collectively help chronology. The growth of Sanskrit language can be traced through three broad stages, viz,. the Vedic Sanskrit, the Brahmanic Sanskrit and the Paninian or Classical Sanskrit; and the sequence of Sanskrit authors can be broadly determined according to the periods allotted to them. The Hindus also seem to have already known the general sequence of the वेद्s, the ब्राह्मणs, the सूत्रs, the स्मृतिs, the भाष्यs and the काव्यs, the succeeding ones of which generally presuppose the preceding ones; and more *ancient works are relatively held more authoritative*. There is, however, some room for alteration in this sequence according to the modern well-defined criteria. Again, the Hindus too have their own chronology (e. g. the eras of युधिष्ठिर, विक्रम, महावीर, शालिवाहन, etc.) and science of astronomy, according to which they assign dates to different personages. Yet all these eras are used more for daily religious observances than for determining the dates of historical facts. The Western scholars, on the other hand, invariably prefer for their own *convenience the Christian era to the former ones* in assigning dates to several facts of Indian history, and the Hindu scholars follow them in this respect. It must be admitted here that the Western scholars, barring some exceptions, exhibit, on the whole, a minute, methodical and critical point of view in

their chronological researches; and this point of view is worthy of being accepted by the Hindu scholars in their own researches.

Chronology gives a definite form to the sequence of events either in the history of the corporate life of a nation or in the history of the individual life of a person. From this point of view it is very instructive to settle the sequence of several works written by the same author like कालिदास by noting the stages of growth in his ideas, outlook on life and the linguistic form suited to his ideas. Chronology which thus seeks to divide immeasurable Time into suitable periods, or social as well as individual life into stages, naturally induces us to compare one period or stage with another on the basis of similarity or contrast. The sentence 'History repeats itself' is true in the case of social as well as individual life. It is, therefore, natural for a man with historical insight to compare and contrast one period with another and synthesize all periods by discovering correlation among them. Thus life-problems, ideals, customs and all sorts of mental and physical activities of different periods can be subjected to the Comparative Method, which in alliance with the Historical Method establishes the causal relation of incidents. This comparative method which makes use of the उपमानप्रमाण (comparison, analogy) further leads us in the light of history to ascertain the influence of one individual, race or period upon another and understand the nature of the whole life, individual or corporate, in its proper

perspective. *Thus for being able to have the* perspective of the whole life of a nation the historian has to undergo a rigorous mental discipline. After making use of verbal testimony (शब्द), perceptual knowledge (प्रत्यक्ष), inference (अनुमान), comparison (उपमान), probability (सम्भव) and tradition (ऐतिह्य) he has to amalgamate the chronological, critical, scientific and comparative methods with the Historical Method, which principally proceeds along the course of Time. He has then to present all particular facts of history in their sequence, with the proper perspective of the whole material, and with due *attention to the permanent substratum of national character* He has, therefore, to take into account the *spirit* or *soul* of all the multifarious activities of a nation through different periods, and present, after eliminating all unnecessary details with a keen sense of proportion, those historical facts alone that bring out this soul This *is the modern idea of history and the science of* historical composition. This scientific charater was lent to history and historical composition only in the 18th century A. D., by the Europeans, and it need not appear strange that it was unknown to the ancient Hindus.

When it was found that the same mental process or discipline that was required for historical investigation was also widely applicable to other departments of knowledge, the Historical Method of general application came into existence That method is now widely *employed for investigation*

into almost all branches of human knowledge like mythology, religion, philosophy, psychology, education, art, literature, philology, textual criticism, Vedic interpretation, studies in Classical Sanskrit, *etc., and has yielded fruitful results,* which have enabled different authors to write the history of some of those subjects. It must be acknowledged that this Historical Method. of study which was non-existent in India is worthy of being availed of by us. *It is an undeniable fact that the* Shastris are well-versed in the use of the above-mentioned प्रमाण्स propounded by the ancient Hindus. *If they will collectively make use of all of them with* particular attention to the course of Time, sequence of events and chronology, they will find it very easy to master the Historical Method. If they are adepts in पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण which are certainly far more abstruse than the Historical Method, they will very easily be able to adopt the Historical Outlook in respect of Sanskrit literature and Shastras.

It has been said above that the task of the historian is not merely to arrange historical facts in their chronological sequence, but also to bring out the causal relation of them and to interpret them in a generalized form. Arrangement of particular facts of history in the light of the historical discipline described above is a topic properly belonging to the Science of History; while the *generalized interpretation* of those particular facts on the basis of the *causal relation* falls regularly within the province of the Philosophy of History. The Philosophy of History

is, therefore, a development of the Science of History, and requires, in addition to the same kind of mental discipline as required by the latter, the synthetic outlook of philosophy and an eye for the culture or soul of a nation rather than for physical events. For being able to give a rational and comprehensive interpretation of historical facts the Philosophy of History has also to depend upon the principles of psychology, logic, metaphysics and ethics. It has thus to see how the human mind works in different situations, what is the most satisfactory theory of the creation of the universe propounded by philosophy in general, and how the generalized interpretation of history is to be presented in a rational manner. It has, moreover, to evaluate human activities leading to success or failure, worldly prosperity or emancipation of the soul, and to show how those activities, external and internal, or individual and corporate, should be regulated and sublimated in the present and the future, so as to reach the final goal. In this respect the comparative method will have to be employed in order to compare the events that have successively taken place in a nation and those in one nation with those in another. The Western Philosophy of History usually seeks the aid of the Evolution Theory for generalized interpretaion. But that theory is inadequate, since it cannot explain what the substratum of that evolution is, whether there would be continuous evolution of humanity, or whether the processes of evolution and devolution, or rise and fall, occurring

on the same substratum, are true in the case of man. Here the idea of the creation of the universe propounded by the Hindu thinkers is a valuable aid to the Philosophy of History; for, it clearly explains that the creation, sustenance and dissolution of the universe occur on the same eternal substratum (ब्रह्मन्), that both the evolution and devolution of humanity depend upon the proportion in *which* human *activities* approach or *depart from that* substratum, and that there is no continuous development, but there are development and decay, rise and fall alternately occurring in the destinies of humanity. The Hindu thinkers divide all human activities into सात्विक, राजस and तामस, and further say that the quality of रजस् creates the universe and leads to worldly prosperity, the सत्त्व sustains both and leads to emancipation, and the तमस् dissolves *everything and leads to destruction.* On the basis of those three qualities they have conceived the idea of four युग (ages) and classified in a philosophical manner the collective activities of humanity in terms of four युग्s. They, therefore, concerned themselves more with the Philosophy of History than with history, pure and simple. It cannot, however, be denied that they could not have given us a consistent Philosophy of History, unless they had some measure of historical sense in themselves. With this historical sense they have described in detail particular facts of history in the रामायण, the महाभारत and the पुराणs for the purpose

of philosophizing on them The only flaw is that those historical facts have been promiscuously mixed with myths and are not given in their *chronological sequence The Hindu thinkers have,* however, never failed to remark rationally that those myths and legends are not to be understood in their literal sense but are to be taken as mere 'अर्थवाद' for approaching the Ultimate Truth

If from the philosophical point of view even the 'historical truth' is relative, and if that relative truth is meant for the *Ultimate Truth*, the ancient Hindus need not be much blamed only for their deficiency in unmixed historical and chronological sense If their process of approach to the Ultimate Truth through the relative truth is correct, in other words, if they reach the real end which is aimed at by the philosophy of history, they should not be much deprecated for adopting purely mythical means along with the relatively real (historical) ones It is true that they ought to have possessed a finer historical sense for arriving at the 'historical truth'. *But when the modern Westernized scholars* begin to magnify this fault and depreciate the Shastris for it, one cannot help remarking that the modern scholars too are deficient in the philosophic outlook on life and Shastric acumen possessed by the ancient Hindu thinkers and some Shastris even of the present day It will have to be admitted *that the Shastric acumen on the one hand and the* historical sense on the other are products of *different kinds of mental discipline, though it is*

possible to amalgamate them in a few cases. When the modern scholars usually express their perverted opinion that the Shastris do not possess 'critical insight', they use the word 'critical' in a narrow and vague sense to suggest the 'historical', or more properly, the 'chronological' sense. The word 'Research' is similarly used by them in the narrow sense of 'historical and chronological research.' If the word 'critical' prominently connotes the sense 'logical' or 'rational', the Shastris are 'critical' enough. It is really strange that the Shastris should be called 'uncritical' simply for want of historical and chronological judgment, when it is quite clear that they can use rigorous logic or the critical, comparative and scientific methods in their search for the Ultimate Truth. It is then desirable that the activities of the modern scholars and Shastris should henceforth start with mutual understanding and cooperation, and should result in making up the deficiency. Nobody can deny the importance of historical truth on the phenomenal plane; yet the means should not be mistaken for the end, and the part which history and historical method have to play in our Sanskrit studies should not be unduly stressed to the detriment of more important branches of Sanskrit literature.

It has been formerly remarked that the Historical Method is applied to many branches of human knowledge and that the history of a particular branch in relation to the past and present achievements gives a proper perspective of the whole sub-

ject. *Again, in alliance with the comparative* and critical methods it supplies us with a wider outlook, deepens our interest in a subject, trains us in rationalism, makes the dead past alive, and helps us to see things with a new meaning. In spite of all *these merits this method has its limitations.* For, engaging us more in the sequence and chronology of events, and in the analysis of facts rather than in their synthesis, it tends to divert our minds from the *spirit* or *sūbstratum* of events. In other words, *it keeps us absorbed in the particular facts of history* rather than in the philosophy of history It is to be remembered that mere history can at best furnish us with concrete illustrations of actual and particular facts, which are inadequate unless they are put to the hard test of Logic and its प्रमाणs, or supplemented by the philosophy of history. For, *the knowledge of truth, relative or absolute, depends upon impartial judgment and the logical प्रमाणs, which are superior to mere history* It ought to be, therefore, properly understood that the Historical Method, which stresses the sequence and chronology of events more than other things, is one among many methods of approach to a subject and *not the only* method It must be admitted here that when the particular *historical* events themselves have yet to be discovered and collected in an organized form of history, the adoption of the Historical Method is most essential. Remembering, therefore, the above limitations of *the method it should be employed with judicious*

care without neglecting other important methods of approach to a subject †

If this method is applied, for instance, to the study of literature, its merits and demerits are clearly perceived The merits of the method lie in bringing before our mind the perspective of the whole literature in its synthetic form, in indirectly helping our appreciation of it, in presenting individual authors of that literature in their sequence, in enabling us to judge the influence of one author upon another, in making us ascertain the place of a particular author in his age and the whole literature, and in aiding us to account for changes in literary ideas and forms from age to age Thus the Historical Method helps in its own way the study of literature, just as literature too supplies history, in a more or less degree, with facts of historical interest. Now the limitations of the Historical Method as applied to literature are as follows —

Though the Historical Method ultimately results in synthesis, it prominently adopts logical analysis and impartial judgment, which give little scope for emotional attitude quite essential to the appreciation of literature Even if it can supply us with an *intellectual explanation* of the circumstances in which a literary work was produced, it cannot help us in the actual enjoyment of the aesthetic

† In this context read Dr Bhandarkar s two essays· 'The Critical, Comparative and Historical Method of Inquiry' and 'Lines for Fresh Research in Sanskrit Literature and Indian Antiquities' in the Collected Works of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, Vol, I pp 362–415.

ject. Again, in alliance with the comparative and critical methods it supplies us with a wider outlook, deepens our interest in a subject, trains us in rationalism, makes the dead past alive, and helps *us to see things with a new meaning. In spite* of all these merits this method has its limitations. For, engaging us more in the sequence and chronology of events, and in the analysis of facts rather than in their synthesis, *it tends to divert* our *minds from* the *spirit* or *substratum* of events. In other words, it keeps us absorbed in the particular facts of history rather than in the philosophy of history. It is to be remembered *that mere history can at best furnish us* with concrete illustrations of actual and particular facts, which are inadequate unless they are put to the hard test of Logic and its प्रमाणs, or supplemented by the philosophy of history. For, *the knowledge of truth, relative* or *absolute, depends upon impartial judgment and the logical* प्रमाणs, *which are superior to mere history.* It ought to be, therefore, properly understood that the Historical Method, which stresses the sequence and chronology of events more than other things, is *one* among many methods of approach to a subject and *not the only* method. It must be admitted here that when the particular historical events themselves have yet to be discovered and collected in an organized form of history, the adoption of the Historical Method is most essential. Remembering, therefore, the above limitations of the method it should be employed with judicious

care without neglecting other important methods of approach to a subject. †

If this method is applied, for instance, to the study of literature, its merits and demerits are clearly perceived. The merits of the method lie in bringing before our mind the perspective of the whole literature in its synthetic form, in indirectly helping our appreciation of it, in presenting individual authors of that literature in their sequence, in enabling us to judge the influence of one author upon another, in making us ascertain the place of a particular author in his age and the whole literature, and in aiding us to account for changes in literary ideas and forms from age to age. Thus the Historical Method helps in its own way the study of literature, just as literature too supplies history, in a more or less degree, with facts of historical interest. Now the limitations of the Historical Method as applied to literature are as follows:—

Though the Historical Method ultimately results in synthesis, it prominently adopts logical analysis and impartial judgment, which give little scope for emotional attitude quite essential to the appreciation of literature. Even if it can supply us with an *intellectual explanation* of the circumstances in which a literary work was produced, it cannot help us in the actual enjoyment of the aesthetic

† In this context read Dr. Bhandarkar's two essays: 'The C [illegible]
and 'L [illegible]
Indian [illegible]
Bhandarkar, Vol, I. pp. 362–415.

element of that work The critical, or more properly, the rational standpoint resorted to in the Historical Method mars the aesthetic delight instead of enhancing it Thus we are engrossed in the external and insipid details about an author rather than in his *personality*, which must be felt as a whole rather than dissected, and for the complete appreciation of which the aesthetic approach based on psychology is the best one Even though some amount of analysis is a necessary step to *synthetic appreciation, it should never exceed its limits and spoil enjoyment of literature*

We find that many modern scholars have up to *this time allotted inordinate space to the fixing of* the dates of Sanskrit poets and dramatists and have *subjected their works to the* discussion of historical facts like the political, social, economical and religious conditions of their respective times rather than to their literary appreciation These external historical facts, though they distantly or circumstantially help appreciation, involve the process of intellectual analysis which, perhaps, turns us away from the main purpose of approach to Personality. It is, *therefore, desirable that the above historical facts should be subordinated to the* main purpose which *is to enter into the spirit* or *heart* of an author The critical or rational method, which has been so far much exalted and which is useful in other spheres, should now make room for the literary criticism of aesthetic appreciation, and proper justice should be done to Sanskrit poets and dramatists by resort-

ing to the extensive criticism of their artistic elements—the unity of plot, the poet's imagination, fancy, sentiments, the sense of proportion exhibited in his ideas and form, and other psychological factors of the poet's personality—which are calculated to enrich our aesthetic experience. This main aim can be best accomplished by applying the principles of रस and ध्वनि propounded, after the harmonization of the theories of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण, by Sanskrit literary critics, and by combining those principles with the principles of psychology applied by Western critics to the literary criticism. This combination will, of course, lead us to the *synthetic appreciation* of Sanskrit literary works. This combination has already been made by us in the preceding sections and will also be made in detail later on. But before approaching those psychological principles of रस and ध्वनि helping synthetic appreciation, it is necessary to turn to the preliminary analytical process which has been adopted in Sanskrit commentaries on poetry and drama, and is also followed by the Shastris in their oral explanation of the same.

X. THE METHODS OF TEACHING LITERATURE (दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय).

We have so far seen how the methods of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण are comprehensively useful in the teaching of शास्त्र and literature. It is now an un-

Detailed explanation of each and every word and its sense (पदपदार्थ) line by line, which helps the *intensive study* of a book, is the *noteworthy quality of almost all of them* Their *explanation*, however, culminates in the complete exposition of अलङ्कार, ध्वनि and रस contained in *individual verses* or *paragraphs only* They are not much inclined to exhibit their expository skill in bringing out synthetically the *whole mind* of a poet as revealed in all his works or at least in one work *as a whole* In this respect the synthetic and psychological method of literary criticism employed by the Western literary critics is worthy of imitation.

It must be remembered that भरत, आनन्दवर्धन and अभिनवगुप्त, who have contributed original theories of रस and ध्वनि to the Sanskrit Poetics (साहित्य), are the pioneers in the field of *synthetic literary criticism*. They have rightly subordinated अलङ्कार, गुण and रीति to the principles of रस and ध्वनि, or more properly to the रसध्वनि, which will be detailed later on आनन्दवर्धन *in the fourth* उद्योत *of the* ध्वन्यालोक *has given his illuminating synthetic appreciation* of the महाभारत, which certainly deserves to stand the test of modern literary criteria, and would be a proper guide to Sanskrit literary' critics wishing to follow that path. This path has, however, been rarely followed by the later आलङ्कारिक्s and Sanskrit *commentators*, who have wasted their energy in the minute analysis of अलङ्कार्s in detached verses The only Sanskrit commentary that makes

an *emotional approach* to poetry and tries to enter into the *heart* of the poet by explaining the inner significance of words is the 'विद्युल्लता' commentary of पूर्णसरस्वती on the 'मेघसन्देश' (मेघदूत) of कालिदास. The ancient Sanskrit works aiming at synthetic criticism, according to our limited information, are the महाभारततात्पर्यनिर्णय of श्रीमध्वाचार्य and the धर्माकूतम् of त्र्यम्बकराय मखिन्, but they have been written mainly with the ethical rather than with the literary or aesthetic purpose The solitary instance of synthetic *literary* criticism, on the model of आनन्दवर्धन's appreciation of the महाभारत, is the concluding passage of राघवभट्ट's commentary on the शाकुन्तल. In the present century, however, two Pandits have attempted synthetic literary criticism through the Sanskrit medium in the light of the Western standard. Of them Pt. R. Krishnamachariar, M. A., has written his रघुवंशविमर्श, मेघसन्देशविमर्श, and कुमारसम्भवविमर्श in felicitous Sanskrit prose, while MM. Pt कालीपद तर्काचार्य in his काव्यचिन्ता has attempted aesthetic appreciation of the works of कालिदास and भवभूति in equally beautiful Sanskrit Prose These two Sanskrit critics have in modern times set a worthy example to other Sanskrit critics in respect of *synthetic literary criticism,* which seeks to approach the Personality of a poet. Rabindranath Tagore's synthetic and emotional appreciations of Sanskrit poets, published in his Bengali book 'प्राचीन साहित्य' are unparalleled in the realm of literary criticism, since they are the specimens of creative art

and testify to the sentence of Ben Jonson "To judge of poets is only the faculty of poets, and not of all poets, but the best ' In short, synthetic and emotional appreciation of Sanskrit poets through the medium of Sanskrit is a desideratum felt long

In spite of the ancient principles of रस and ध्वनि and the above-mentioned books comprising synthetic appreciation, the Shastris in general unnecessarily stress the intellectual process of the minute analysis of अलङ्कारs, *in which respect even* the University graduates blindly follow them There are again,a few *Shastris*, who consider it below their dignity to teach 'Literature', and say that poetry is to be sung by harlots (रण्डागीतानि काव्यानि) If such Shastris are sometimes required to teach literature', their lessons, which mostly comprise grammatical or etymological discussions, are uninteresting and tiresome to young pupils Barring a few such exceptions there are a good many of them, who with real zest for literature have developed fine literary taste in themselves, and hence are able to develop aesthetic attitude among their pupils Such Shastris are undoubtedly able to maintain interest and enthusiasm among their pupils by expounding literature *in an enchanting manner* Thus though all *Shastris* are at one in generally following the theories of पद, वाक्य, प्रमाण and साहित्य *in their teaching their* methods in regard to the treatment of literature vary *from* person to person

There is, therefore, no standardization among the Shastris as regards the methods of teaching

literature and the number and sequence of steps to be followed in their lessons. The actual steps used by the Shastris in a 'Literature Lesson' vary from five to eight. An ancient couplet gives five steps to be followed while a literary subject is being expounded to pupils of tender age. They are (i) Separation of Sandhis in words, (ii) Meaning of words, (iii) Dissolution of compounds, (iv) Construing of words or sentences, and (v) Answer to an objection *

In consultation with several Shastris in the different parts of India, we have been able to determine that in spite of a few variations, five common steps are generally adopted everywhere for the teaching of prose as well as poetry. In their succession they are as follows —

(i) Separation of Sandhis in words (पदच्छेदः), (ii) Construing (अन्वय), (iii) Dissolution of compounds (समासविग्रह), (iv) Explanation of words unknown to pupils (पदार्थकथनम्), (v) Substance of a sentence, paragraph or verse (तात्पर्यम्) $

Here, according to the needs of pupils and the nature of the language material to be taught the Shastris add 'Parsing of words' after पदच्छेद,

---

* पदच्छेद पदार्थोक्तिर्विग्रहो वाक्ययोजना ।
आक्षेपस्य समाधान व्याख्यान पञ्चलक्षणम् ॥

$ These five steps may be versified as follows —
पदच्छेदोऽन्वयोक्तिश्च समासादिविवेचनम् ।
पदार्थबोधस्तात्पर्यं व्याख्यावयवपञ्चकम् ॥

'Translation' after पदार्थकथन, and 'Discussion of constructional aspect' (प्रयोगविवेचन) after तात्पर्यकथन as three more steps, which are dropped when the pupils are sufficiently advanced Notwithstanding the general adoption of these five formal steps, there is full scope for the ingenuity of a tactful teacher in the treatment of his topic One thing to be borne in mind is that every 'literature lesson' is accompanied by loud reading, which is mostly neglected in the grammar-translation method Again, in all such lessons, pupils are required to take more active part than the teacher, who generally guides and corrects the pupils where necessary.

Reading— Generally at the initial stage the teacher reads for pupils, but after some acquaintance with language, pupils are invariably made to read a passage loudly, at the beginning of every lesson Of course, for fear of adverse criticism from the teacher, the pupils have to practise this reading beforehand While the reading is going on, attention is always to be paid to distinct articulation, pitch of voice, intonation, pause, emphasis, phrasing, etc * From all these points of view the reading of the Shastris is expressive and flawless, so that it would serve graduate teachers as a model for imitation It is worthy of note that many Shastris can repeat from memory several passages in prose and verse and can teach even without the aid of a book Thus, being free to discourse direct,

* The detailed treatment of all these will be found in 'Reading and Recitation' in this book.

ly with their pupils, they can gain the advantage over graduate teachers of making their personal influence felt more.

(i) *Separation of Sandhis* (पदच्छेदः)–Separation of Sandhis in a sentence or verse follows the reading of the same. Here also the pupils have to take more part than the teacher as before. Along with this separation of Sandhis, the grammatical form of every word has to be recognized by the pupils. By this continued practice in the separation of words pupils develop their knowledge of Sandhis incidentally without learning rules; and when the forms of different words in a sentence are known beforehand by pupils from the रूपावलि, the matter of splitting Sandhis becomes an easy task for them. With the knowledge of the basic facts of the vernacular grammar, pupils are here able to give all the parts of speech, viz., a noun, a pronoun, an adjective, a verb, an indeclinable, etc. After eliciting the original forms of words (i. e. the nominative singular), pupils are led to recognize the different cases of words as used in a sentence or verse, and to connect those forms by analogy with the forms of model words already learnt in the शब्दरूपावलि. This is the place where pupils realize the utility and importance of having at their fingers' ends the forms in the रूपावलि. This procedure is resorted to at the initial stage until pupils get sufficient practice in the ready recognition of the grammatical froms of words. Although this process makes for the clear understanding of

each and every word, beginners find it rather irksome and lengthy. If young pupils are by nature more intent on the human element (story-interest) of a passage than on the grammatical forms of words, it would be expedient to postpone this detailed parsing of words to a later stage We must, however, note that this sub-division of the first step is not compulsorily followed by all Shastris

(ii) *Construing or arrangement of words* (अन्वयः)—The second step to be followed in a 'literature lesson' is 'construing' or the arrangement of words in their syntactical order Taking into account the facts indicated above, the Shastris, in expounding literature to their students, follow a few syntactical rules, which have been recorded in some Sanskrit manuals † for beginners and which undoubtedly train those students in construing literature by self-help It is well worthy of note that the students of the Pathashalas are able to construe any unseen passage in Sanskrit, after the study of a few cantos from a महाकाव्य, while the students of high schools and colleges cannot do so even after studying Sanskrit for years It is, therefore, highly desirable to bring the knowledge of those syntactical rules to bear upon the understanding of literature

(a) दण्डान्वय – 'Construing' or the arrangement of words in their syntactical order is the most

† Read —(a) रघुरामकृत 'श्लोकयोजनिकोपाय, (b) ओङ्कारदासविरचित 'अन्वयबोध', and (c) The concluding portions on कारक in the 'समासचक्रम्'.

important step in a 'literature lesson', and its proper knowledge is indispensable to the study of Sanskrit literature When the arbitrariness of the order of words in a Sanskrit sentence necessitates this arrangement even in a prose passage, it is needless to say that verses also must be construed. For being able to construe, definite knowledge of *the function of cases or कारक, as indicated above,* is to be presupposed, and the most important fact *to be borne in mind is first of all, the functions of* the nominative and accusative cases So the first thing for the students to do is to find out for themselves or sometimes with the help of the teacher the principal sentence which generally consists of the subject, the object, and the finite verb For this purpose it is necessary for them to know that in the active construction the subject is in the nominative case and the object in the accusative When students are able to determine the inflexions of all words, they can easily distinguish the nominative from the oblique cases and find out the subject Now, the subject can occur in a sentence in any one of the three persons and numbers, and the finite verb must agree with it in respect of both of them If a participle is used as a finite verb, it should agree with the subject in person, number and gender also. *Being equipped with this information, students can* readily construe the subject with the verb or the verb with the subject according as either of them is *expressed or understood. If the verb is understood,* it is to be supplied according to the form of the

subject which is expressed, on the other hand; if the subject is understood, it is to be supplied according to the form of the verb which is expressed

After being thus fully acquainted with the active construction, the next important fact for the students to remember is the passive construction, in which the subject being in the instrumental case and the object in the nominative, the finite verb agrees with the object in number and person, and if a participle is used as a finite verb, it agrees with the object in number, person and gender also Here, parallelism between a Marathi sentence like 'त्यानें काम केलें' and its corresponding Sanskrit sentence 'तेन कर्म कृतम्' can be sought with advantage The knowledge of these basic facts, which are already known by students in their mother tongue, leads *them to find out the principal sentence* When the principal sentence has thus been found out, students are led to construe the remaining words of the whole sentence

In a Sanskrit sentence the remaining words, which are chiefly of four kinds are the substantive, the adjective, the indeclinable and the verbal form.

The *substantive* can be sub-divided into a noun and pronoun, both of which can occur in a sentence in the nominative case as the subject, or in any other case-relation, gender, number and person In a sentence, words in the instrumental *case are to be placed after the subject and before* words in the accusative, ablative and locative. Words in the ablative case should immediately

precede verbs governing the ablative, but sometimes they may precede even the subject, the object, and words in the instrumental and the locative. Words in the locative signifying time or place, those in the vocative, interjections and interrogative words should generally be put at the beginning of a sentence. An adjective doing the work of a noun should be treated accordingly.

Adjectives which generally qualify substantives are to be construed with the latter and placed before them. The special feature of Sanskrit is that an adjective always agrees with its substantive in gender, number and case. Of course, adjectives in a particular gender, number and case are to be construed with the substantives in the same gender, number and case. Since a Sanskrit sentence generally contains many adjectives qualifying a substantive, all of them should be put together and joined with the indeclinable 'च'. Attributive adjectives must be placed before their substantives; but predicative adjectives or adverbs should come after substantives and stand immediately before verbs or other adjectives. Adjectives to pronouns are generally placed before the latter; yet, if an adjective is intended to be more prominent than a pronoun, it should be placed in its predicative sense after the pronoun. Words in the genitive case do the work of adjectives and are to be construed with the substantives to which they are related, even though several other words occur between the genitive forms and their substantives.

As the forms of *indeclinables* are unchangeable under all circumstances, there need be no difficulty in construing them with their respective words.

Verbal forms denote an action, complete or incomplete. Those denoting a complete action are finite verbs or participles used as finite verbs, which are either active or passive, which show three tenses, and are to be construed with the subject and the object according as they are transitive or intransitive. Verbal forms showing an incomplete action are absolutives and infinitives, which are invariably *to be placed before finite verbs* The *object* to an absolutive or infinitive must, of course, precede either of them In the case of verbs governing two accusatives, the direct object should be *placed just* before the finite verb and after the indirect one. In short, for arranging words in a Sanskrit sentence according to their syntactical relations, the subject will have to be placed first, words in the accusative and other cases afterwards, absolutives and infinitives with their objects, if any, in the middle, and the finite verb last The construing method, in which all the words of the whole sentence are thus arranged, is named as 'दण्डान्वयपद्धति'. 'दण्ड', which means 'a staff' with many knots represents the whole sentence with its various parts or sections (खण्ड), or in Sanskrit 'दण्ड' is the vertical punctuation mark used to denote the completion of a sentence Thus, the construing of words in a complete sentence standing between vertical marks is designated as 'दण्डान्वय'. Hence, in the दण्डान्वय-

पद्धति all the words in a complete sentence are arranged according to their grammatical function and syntactical relation While construing, the Shastris, with due attention to these syntactical rules, desire their students to have the inner working of their minds as indicated above So in this method questions in the mother tongue as, 'Which is the subject?', 'Which is the object?', 'Which is the verb?' etc, are asked to bring out the natural order of words in a sentence Yet, such questions being mainly of a grammatical or formal type bore the pupils Such a procedure, no doubt, helps clear understanding and is suited to the pupils of very small classes where individual attention is possible But for large classes it would be monotonous

(b) खण्डान्वय –$ There is another method of construing 'खण्डान्वयपद्धति' by name, which resembles the former only in respect of picking out first the principal sentence, but differs from the दण्डान्वय with regard to the construing of the remaining words of the whole sentence In the खण्डान्वयपद्धति the use of several interrogative words in suitable Sanskrit questions enables the exponent to elicit

$ दण्डवत् खण्डवच्चैव द्विभेदोऽन्वय उच्यते ।
आद्ये विशेषण पूर्वं विशेष्य तदनन्तरम् ॥
कत्वाणमुख्यप्रभृत्येव पूर्वं दण्डान्वये भवेत् ।
—ओङ्कारदासविरचित 'अन्वयप्रबोध'।

different adjuncts in a sentence § and explain them *by using simpler equivalents* After this construing the order of words in the whole sentence will be the same as in the दण्डान्वय, but this construing is carried on in parts or sections (खण्ड) by framing questions on individual words or phrases In this questioning students must be also assumed to possess the knowledge of the same syntactical relations as recently described, and the same rules for construing as set forth above hold good here Yet, both these methods differ from each other in the types of questions framed and in the order in which words in a sentence are elicited Thus in a sentence the principal clause should be elicited before words in the oblique cases (from the instrumental to the locative), absolutives and infinitives before their objects, substantives before adjectives and verbs before adverbs Even in the principal clause the verbal form should be elicited before the subject with its adjuncts and the subject before the object with its adjuncts.

In the दण्डान्वयपद्धति *questions are mainly of a* grammatical or formal type, while in the खण्डान्वय, they are principally based on the subject-matter

---

§ कर्तृकर्मक्रियास्तावच्छ्लोके योज्यास्तत परम् ।
किमो रूप पुरस्कृत्य तृतीयादि नियोजयेत् ॥
ल्यबन्त च तुमन्त च क्त्वान्त कर्मविभूषितम् ।
—रघुरामकृत श्लोकयोजनिकोपाय ।
क्त्वाणमुल्ल्यप्प्रभृत्येव पूर्वं दण्डान्वये भवेत् ।
खण्डान्वये पुन प्रश्नपूर्वमन्ते प्रयोजयेत् ॥३६॥
—ओङ्कारदासकृतोऽन्वयप्रबोध ।

or the sense of a literary passage rather than on the grammatical function. Though in the adoption of the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, syntactical relations are implied in the questions on a literary piece, they are of a *secondary importance. Thus questions to elicit* words with different senses are asked as follows:—

(1) *Persons or things* denoted by nouns and pronouns in a sentence are elicited by framing questions with the various case-forms of किम्; as कः, कम्, केन, कस्मै etc.

(2) *Qualities or attributes* denoted by adjectives are elicited by using in questions words like कीदृश, कथम्भूत, किम्भूत, किंविशिष्ट, किंलक्षण etc., along with substantives (nouns or pronouns).

(3) *Actions* shown by verbs or participles can be elicited according to their number and person through questions wherein the subject is used with words like, 'किं करोति–कुरुतः–कुर्वन्ति' or कुर्वत्, कृत, कृतवत्, कर्तव्य etc.

(4) The *priority* or *purpose* of an action shown by absolutives and infinitives can be elicited by using in questions words like 'किं कृत्वा' and 'किं कर्तुम्' respectively.

(5) *Time, place, manner, purpose, reason, etc.,* denoted by adverbs can be elicited by using with the verbal form words like कदा, कुत्र, कथम्, किमर्थम्, कुतः, कस्मात् कारणात् etc.

These types of questions and several other types have been actually used in some Sanskrit

commentaries on the पञ्चमहाकाव्यs *and some works on Shastras by the commentators following the* खण्डान्वयपद्धति. These question forms can be advantageously utilized at one's discretion in the teaching of Sanskrit by maintaining variety in questioning The characteristic of a Sanskrit sentence, however, is that its major portion generally consists of adjectives which are either single words or sentences compressed into a बहुव्रीहि compound It is, therefore, inevitable that the same question forms with the use of कीदृश, कथम्भूत etc, have often to be resorted to, there being little scope for variety in the wording of such questions every time We thus see that the questioning in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति draws the attention of students more to the *spirit* or the *sentiment* of a literary piece than to its grammatical aspect; and hence, according to the accepted technique of modern teaching the humanistic side of language study can be more attended to in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति than the formal one

Again, there are two possible ways in which the subject and the verb of a principal sentence may be elicited In the दण्डान्वयपद्धति the subject is generally picked up first and the verb afterwards; while in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति the verb, which is first picked up is connected with the subject and the object by *framing suitable questions These two* methods are based on the principles laid down by the नैयायिकs, मीमांसकs and वैयाकरणs The नैयायिकs are of opinion that the subject is the principal word in

a sentence, the मीमांसक assert that the verbal form is the principal word to which all the words in a sentence are related, and the वैयाकरण hold the root-meaning of a verbal form to be important. So the दण्डान्वयपद्धति seems to have its source in the theory of the नैयायिक, while the खण्डान्वयपद्धति owes its existence to the theory of the मीमांसक. For practical purposes no distinction need be observed in regard to the precedence of the subject or the verb in construing. Yet the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, which is superior to the दण्डान्वय in appealing to the students' instinct of curiosity and their literary sense, naturally leads us to side with the मीमांसक who recognize the precedence of the verb and the importance of आकाङ्क्षा.

With special reference to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति we may say that the knowledge of expectancy (आकाङ्क्षा), consistency (योग्यता) and contiguity (आसत्ति or सन्निधि) as recognized by all schools of thought is quite essential to 'construing' or comprehension of a sentence.$ When a word cannot convey the whole meaning of a sentence owing to the absence of some other word, there is expectancy (आकाङ्क्षा)§ or the desire to know the other word. For instance,

---

$ आकाङ्क्षा योग्यता सन्निधिश्च वाक्यार्थज्ञानहेतुः। (तर्कसङ्ग्रह)। वाक्यजन्ये च ज्ञाने आकाङ्क्षायोग्यतासत्तयस्तात्पर्यज्ञानं चेति चत्वारि कारणानि। (वेदान्तपरिभाषा)

§ (a) पदस्य पदान्तरव्यतिरेकप्रयुक्तान्वयाननुभावकत्वमाकाङ्क्षा। (तर्कसङ्ग्रह.)

if in a sentence 'रामो घटमानयति' we suppose that the word 'आनयति' is absent, we have a desire to know the verb. A question that naturally arises is 'किं करोति रामः ?' and the expectancy is fulfilled when the verb 'आनयति' is supplied. Similarly, if we suppose that the words 'रामः' and 'घटम्' are absent in the above sentence, there is a desire to know (आकाङ्क्षा) the subject and the object respectively, and further questions arise, as 'कः आनयति ?' and 'किम् (or कम्) आनयति ?' This desire to know 'What about राम, घट,' etc., is curiosity itself which gives rise to various questions. The मीमांसक्s while dealing with 'भावना' (energy or efficient force) refer to this आकाङ्क्षा and say that it expresses itself in three ways, viz., साध्याकाङ्क्षा, साधनाकाङ्क्षा and इतिकर्तव्यताकाङ्क्षा. The first variety of आकाङ्क्षा is related to an 'end' or 'object' and expresses itself in the question-form 'किं भावयेत् ?' (What should be done?); the second is related to a 'means' or 'instrument' and expresses itself in the question-form 'केन भावयेत् ?' (By what should it be done?); and the third is related to the 'manner' of doing and expresses itself in the question-form 'कथं भावयेत् ?' (How should it be done?). It will be

(b) यत्पदेन विना यस्याननुभावकता भवेत् (आकाङ्क्षा)।
—भाषापरिच्छेदः ।

(c) तत्र पदार्थानां परस्परजिज्ञासाविषयत्वयोग्यत्वम् आकाङ्क्षा। क्रियाश्रवणे कारकस्य, कारकश्रवणे क्रियायाः, करणश्रवणे इतिकर्तव्यतायाश्च जिज्ञासाविषयत्वात् । (वेदान्तपरिभाषा)

found that 'आकाङ्क्षा' principally leads us to ask questions, which can be framed by taking the verbal form in a sentence as the principal word, and which can be put to students with the view of helping them in construing (अन्वय) the words of a sentence and understanding their implications. It is thus clear that all questioning in language-study originates principally in this Expectancy or आकाङ्क्षा.

In addition to Expectancy there must be Consistency (योग्यता) * in the words of a sentence, i. e. the meaning of a word must be consistent with that of the other. For example, in the sentence 'पयसा सिञ्चति' the word 'पयस्' (water) is consistent with 'सिञ्चति'. But in the sentence 'अग्निना सिञ्चति', it being impossible to sprinkle anything with fire, the two words are not consistent with each other, although 'अग्निना' has 'आकाङ्क्षा' for 'सिञ्चति'.

Now Contiguity (आसत्ति or सन्निधि)† is uninterrupted utterance or unbroken apprehension of words which are placed in juxtaposition. If each word in a sentence is uttered after a long interval, or if

* (अ) अर्थाबाधो योग्यता। (तर्कसंग्रह)। (आ) पदार्थे तत्र तद्वत्ता योग्यता परिकीर्तिता (भाषापरिच्छेद)। (इ) योग्यता च तात्पर्यविषयसंसर्गाबाधः (वेदान्तपरिभाषा)।

† (अ) पदानामविलम्बेनोच्चारणं सन्निधिः (तर्कसंग्रह)। (आ) सन्निधानं तु पदस्यासत्तिरुच्यते (भाषापरिच्छेद)। (इ) आसत्तिश्चाव्यवधानेन पदजन्यपदार्थोपस्थितिः। मानान्तरेणोपस्थितपदार्थस्यान्वयबोधाभावात् पदजन्येति। (वेदान्तपरिभाषा)।

words in a sentence are not placed in juxtaposition, the sentence would make no sense, although the words in it might possess आकाङ्क्षा and योग्यता.

It will thus be seen that आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and संनिधि, the causes which yield the construed or unified meaning of a sentence, are usually taken to be the characteristics of words. Really speaking, 'आकाङ्क्षा' (Expectancy, desire to know), which is a property of the human mind, contains mainly a psychological element. For, it is not words but human beings that have a desire to know. But 'expectancy' is attributed to words in a secondary sense (उपचार), since a word conveys a meaning which further arouses in the mind of a reader or hearer a desire to know the meaning of another word connected with it. $ Again, योग्यता (Compatibility, consistency) concerns itself more with *meanings* or *things* denoted by words than with words themselves. योग्यता, which is really a property of things, is attributed to words in a secondary sense as things and words denoting them are closely related. It is only आसत्ति or संनिधि (Contiguity) that is properly a property of words themselves. In short, the process of construing, particularly that in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, is

$ सा (आकाङ्क्षा) चैकपदार्थज्ञाने तदर्थान्वययोग्यार्थस्य यज्ज्ञानं तद्विषयेच्छा 'अस्यान्वय्यर्थः कः' इत्येवंरूपा पुरुषनिष्ठैव, तथापि तस्याः स्वविषयेऽर्थे आरोपः। अयमर्थोऽर्थान्तरमाकाङ्क्षतीति व्यवहारात्। ... पदं साकाङ्क्षमिति तु साकाङ्क्षार्थबोधकमित्यर्थकम्। इ०

(नागेशकृता परमलघुमञ्जूषा)

based on the psychological principles of language-study propounded by the Hindu schools of thought.

In *connection with* 'आकाङ्क्षा', which may psychologically be termed 'curiosity' it can definitely be said that several traces of the modern technique of reformed teaching are found scattered in the vast range of Sanskrit literature In ancient times, *the method of questions and answers* that owes its rise to this आकाङ्क्षा was a method of wider application in oral teaching. Various dialogues in the Upanishads, भगवद्गीता, योगवासिष्ठ, महाभारत etc., and the dialogue-form predominantly employed in the ancient works on different शास्त्र (व्याकरण, मीमांसा, etc.) are, as it were, the actual records of the oral lessons (प्रपाठक) given, and bear ample testimony to the *fact that the method of questions and answers was* largely used in expounding a subject, though in later times this ancient method was replaced by the 'Lecture Method' in the शाङ्करभाष्य and similar works. The method of questions and answers may thus be said to have been developed in the infancy of humanity, while the 'Lecture Method' came into existence to suit the advanced stage of human understanding. This fact further proves the psychological truth that the Method of Questions and Answers is very well suited to the curiosity and capacity of juvenile as well as average students; whereas the Lecture Method can be effective only when the students' understanding, power of concentration, and capacity for passive listening are sufficiently advanced.

The ancient method of questioning, however, differs in some respects from the modern one. *According to the modern technique chiefly* the teacher has to ask questions and the pupils to answer them, whereas in ancient times *comprehensive questions* (परिप्रश्न) *were* asked by students, and teachers answered them Answers were given by ancient teachers at the psychological moment *when the curiosity of the* pupils had been fully awakened (उत्थिताकाङ्क्षा) by trying to discover things for themselves as in the Heuristic Method. *Sometimes* the teachers, by making use of 'Suggestion' in their teaching, created opportunities to rouse the curiosity (उत्थाप्याकाङ्क्षा) of their pupils or bring about the psychological moment, when the need for explanation would be badly felt. Besides, the ancient teachers having an exceptional power of supplying concrete and apt illustrations repeatedly utilized the means of knowledge called 'comparison' (उपमानप्रमाण), and told interesting stories for expounding highly philosophical abstractions In short, आकाङ्क्षा (expectancy or curiosity) along with योग्यता (consistency) and सन्निधि (contiguity) forms the backbone of the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, which can be designated as the 'Dialogue Method', 'Conversational Method' or the '*Method of Questions and Answers*'.

In contrast with the दण्डान्वयपद्धति questions in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति are *asked in Sanskrit* and not in the mother tongue, for, the construing of a Sans-

krit passage is manifestly possible in Sanskrit *alone. Construing a Sanskrit poem or a prose passage in the mother tongue is a contradiction in terms, and it is as unnatural as dissolving Sanskrit compounds in the mother tongue! It is, therefore,* against nature and common sense to ask questions in the mother tongue to get at Sanskrit prose order. If questions in the mother tongue could be asked on a *Sanskrit* passage, they would possibly be of the formal type as referred to in the treatment of the दण्डान्वयपद्धति. *But when the* खण्डान्वयपद्धति *is adopted,* questions have to be framed *mainly on the subject-matter* and *secondarily on the grammatical forms of words.* If exclusive use of the mother tongue is made for eliciting even the subject-matter, 'the answers received from students must obviously be in the mother tongue. Where is then scope for *attending to the original language of a passage* and ascertaining the inter-relations of words in a sentence? It is really unintelligible how *according* to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति vernacular questions could be framed on a Sanskrit passage in prose or verse, and be answered in the vernacular! The procedure appears to be so artificial that on account of this prominence of the mother tongue in a literature-lesson, the Sanskrit language of the passage without *being studied is in danger of being thrown* over-board!

For a good grasp of Sanskrit, due attention to its syntax and other peculiarities ought to be paid, though it would be a means to the end which is

primarily the understanding and appreciation of literature. Various constructional aspects of Sanskrit would be properly attended to, if *the actual wording of a Sanskrit passage would be elicited from the pupils for supplying full explanation in simple Sanskrit;* and this is made possible only through *Sanskrit* questions. These are some of the reasons why in the खडान्वयपद्धति questions are asked in Sanskrit and not in the mother tongue.

Too much adherence to the usual question-forms in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति is likely to result in monotony, to avoid which variety in the wording of questions will have to be maintained. For instance, at the initial stage instead of dissolving compounds in the prosaic traditional way, questions should sometimes be so framed that the compounds might of themselves be dissolved, and that the pupils might be led to understand intuitively the mutual relations of their different members. The questions at the initial stage should again be amplified by other questions asked to elicit even the subject, object and verb of the principal clause, which in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति is purposely isolated from the whole sentence and supplied by the teacher or the commentator through a statement. Again, at the advanced stage of the study of Sanskrit, intelligent questions according to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति will have to be framed with tact to get at the subtle suggestion (व्यङ्ग्यार्थ) of words or a passage, to ascertain the purport (तात्पर्यार्थ) of a literary piece, to elicit the imagery of a poem by appealing to the emotions

and imagination of students, to bring, the poet's felicity of expression to their notice, and to impress upon their minds the writer's outlook on life.

Although the Shastris are aware of this खण्डान्वयपद्धति on account of their study of Sanskrit commentaries, they do not seem now-a-days to bring it into practice. Perhaps, being fond of reading learned commentaries written in a high-flown style they *generally disfavour the simple* and loose style of the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, which for the very reason conduces to the better understanding of students. Or possibly, owing to a very small number of pupils in their *classes they are not required to adopt this method;* and they find it convenient for such compact classes to have recourse to the दण्डान्वय, which is more favourable for 'lecturing' than for 'questioning'. When the 'Lecture Method' is still so much prevalent all over India even in English Schools and Colleges in spite of the advent of improved methods of teaching, it would be unjust to deprecate the Shastris for relying much on the 'Lecture Method'. The खण्डान्वयपद्धति, though not practised by the Shastris in their teaching, *has been widely used in Sanskrit commentaries on famous poems and other classics. For explaining abstruse thoughts in different* शास्त्र*s, as in the* व्याकरणमहाभाष्य *of* पतञ्जलि *

* (a) "In Katyayana and Patanjali we can already recognise the technical reasoning, the dialectics of the Purva-Mimamsa and the philosophical schools, where the doubts and difficulties are formulated as dilemmas and where the solution of

and the मीमांसासूत्रभाष्य *of* शबरस्वामी, *this method has been invariably used. Thus the* खण्डान्वयपद्धति

---

one dilemma starts the formulation of a new dilemma and so on in a long stream of debate, and where even the accuracy of expression seems to acquire mathematical exactness '

—Studies on Panini's Grammar, by Barend Faddegon, p, 42.

(b) The method of Patanjali's Great Commentary–" This method is analogous to that which has become familiar through the classical commentaries of शङ्कर on the Upanishads, of मेधातिथि and कुल्लूक on मनु, of सायण on the Vedas of विज्ञानेश्वर on याज्ञवल्क्य, and so on Its character chiefly consists in establishing, usually by repetition, the correct reading of the text, in explaining every important or doubtful word, in *showing the connection of the principal parts of the* sentence and in adding such observations as may be required for a better understanding of the author Patanjali even excels in the latter respect, the commentaries instanced, for he frequently attaches his own critical remarks to the emendations of कात्यायन, often in support of the views of the *latter, but not seldom too, in order to refute his criticisms* and to defend पाणिनि, while, again, at other times, he com*pletes the statement of one of them by his own additional* rules —Panini, by Goldstucker, p 100

(c) " The महाभाष्य *is interesting stylistically as giving us* a lively picture of the mode of discussion of the day A *question is posed an* आचार्यदेशीय *deals with it, not altogether* Incompetently but not quite satisfactorily, and an आचार्य solves the issue *The style, therefore is lively, simple,* animated, and not rarely do we find the question 'Wherefore?', 'How?', or 'What?' put and then answered. Proverbial expressions and references to matters of everyday

is not only useful in juvenile teaching, but is also of immense advantage in the higher study of Sanskrit. But the Shastris, notwithstanding their familiarity with this खण्डान्वयपद्धति, have not realized the value of their own method as the most effective means of studying and teaching language. On the other hand, University students, who study Sanskrit, being more disposed to rely upon English translations of Sanskrit works than read original texts with their Sanskrit commentaries, are quite in the dark about the खण्डान्वय. If a few of them ever care to read Sanskrit commentaries, they mostly come across commentators like मल्लिनाथ and others, who have almost adopted the दण्डान्वय for explanation. They do not at all know that there are many published as well as unpublished Sanskrit commentaries on काव्य, written according to the

life are introduced and serve both to enliven the discussions and to give us valuable hints of the conditions of life and thought in the time of Patanjali, who thus is a source of information for religious and social history as well as for literature."

[1] "The सूत्र [The पूर्वमीमांसासूत्र] develops a method which is common to Indian science generally, and which was adopted by the writers on law, the subject is posed, the doubt is raised, the *prima facie* view is set out, then the correct decision is developed, and the matter brought into connexion with other relevant doctrines."

—A History of Sanskrit Literature, by A. B. Keith.

खण्डान्वयपद्धति,† *which is the continuation of the Dialectic Method of* पतञ्जलि *and others, and which, being perfectly psychological, can be brought into line with the most effective methods of teaching language as recently developed in the West.* Owing to this ignorance the graduates, who were keenly intent on the improvement of Sanskrit teaching, could not bring the indigenous खण्डान्वयपद्धति

---

† The following are some of the Sanskrit commentaries representative of the खण्डान्वयपद्धति—

१ नैषधीयचरितम्–नैषधीयप्रकाशाख्यनारायणीयटीकासहितम् ।

२ शिशुपालवधम्–वल्लभदेवविरचितसन्देहविषौषधिव्याख्यासनाथम् । [वल्लभदेव is a well-known Kashmirian commentator of the first half of the 10th century A. D.]

३ कुमारसम्भवम्–नवनीतरामकृतबुद्धिबोधिनीव्याख्यायुतम् । [Unpublished]

४ मेघदूतम्–वल्लभदेवविरचितमेघदूतविवृतिसमेतम् ।

५ मेघदूतम्–स्थिरदेवकृतव्याख्यासनाथम् ।

६ यशस्तिलकचम्पूः–श्रुतसागरसूरिकृतचन्द्रिकाख्यव्याख्यासहिता ।

७ गीतगोविन्दम्–कुम्भनृपतिप्रणीतरसिकप्रियाव्याख्यासहितम् ।

८ गीतगोविन्दम्–शङ्करमिश्रनिर्मितरसमञ्जरीसमेतम् ।

९ अमरुशतकम्–अर्जुनवर्मदेवप्रणीतरसिकसञ्जीवनीयुतम् ।

१० सूर्यशतकम्–त्रिभुवनपालप्रणीतटीकासहितम् ।

११ साम्बपञ्चाशिका–राजानकक्षेमराजविरचितविवृतिसमेता ।

१२ राघवपाण्डवीयम्–शशधरकृतप्रकाशटीकासहितम् ।

१३ युधिष्ठिरविजयम्–राजानकरत्नकण्ठकृतटीकासहितम् ।

१४ हीरसौभाग्यम्–श्रीदेवविमलगणिविरचित स्वोपज्ञव्याख्यासहितम् ।

to light and had to look for help at the Direct Method of the West!

After judging the relative merits of these two methods of construing, we find that the खण्डान्वय is far superior to the दण्डान्वय in respect of language-teaching. In the first place, it is purely a psychological method suited to the instincts of pupils, since predominance of questioning in it is expected to arouse their curiosity (उत्थाप्याकाङ्क्षा) to the fullest extent and maintain constant interest in the classroom. Secondly, it is more suitable for group teaching than for individual teaching. Particularly for the large modern classes where heterogeneous types of pupils are trying to avail themselves of the ancient lore enshrined in Sanskrit, the खण्डान्वयपद्धति of the Sanskrit commentaries is the proper method calculated to ensure co-operation between the teacher and the taught. Thirdly, in the individual and intensive study of original Sanskrit works of a higher type, the commentaries following the खण्डान्वयपद्धति are sure to enlighten a student by making clear the inter-relations of words and ideas, nay, every minute detail, through the questions employed in them. Fourthly, the खण्डान्वय is more appropriate than the दण्डान्वय for the teaching of poetry. Prose order or the regular construing in the दण्डान्वय mars the beauty of a poem instead of enhancing it; while questions in the खण्डान्वय can be so framed as to bring the emotional content of a poem into prominence and lead the

pupils to understand automatically the relations of different words in a sentence Thus the खण्डान्वय helps us to bring out the hidden charm of a poem, heightens our sentiments and creates living poetic atmosphere which is most desirable for the real appreciation of that poem In short, the खण्डान्वयपद्धति bears close resemblance to the Direct Method, which in actual use is much akin to the 'Question-and-answer Method' that forms the main part of language lessons It is worthy of note what the modern authorities on language-teaching say about this 'Question-and-answer Method'—

"Question-and-answer work is the most effective of all the language-learning exercises ever devised *In its various forms and grades it initiates*, develops and utilizes the natural language-learning forces with which we are all endowed It is the quickest and most effective approach both to the spoken and the written aspects of the language, it is the shortest cut to writing, and it may be adopted for purposes so diverse as the teaching of conversation, of abstract grammar, of composition, and of pronunciation" -'This Language-learning Business', By H E Palmer, and H V Redman

It is needless to add here that the above remarks are equally applicable to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति. Now that we have discovered that the indigenous खण्डान्वयपद्धति, when it is amalgamated with the usage of elders (वृद्धव्यवहार), is much the same as the Direct Method, many misconceptions about the New Method of teaching Sanskrit will vanish. When

we can see so much agreement between both these methods, will it not be unjust now to say that we are imitating the Westerners? Of course, in the light of the Western Principles of Language-Study, which also coincide with the main principles of the Indian schools of thought, the खण्डान्वयपद्धति will have to be modified a little to suit the present needs.

After thus dealing at length with the utility and importance of the second step of a 'Literature' lesson according to the Shastri method, and taking into account the manifold purposes for which their खण्डान्वयपद्धति could profitably be used, it would now be advisable to turn to the remaining steps

(iii) Dissolution of compounds (समासविग्रहः) *and (iv) Explanation of words unknown to pupils* (पदार्थकथनम्).

As both these (i. e the third and the fourth) steps are adopted simultaneously by the Shastris instead of following them one after the other, it is expedient to combine the two into one For, the meaning of a compound is not understood unless individual words in it are explained, and the meaning of the whole sentence cannot be grasped unless all the compounds in it are dissolved. Again, in order to dissolve compounds correctly, it is necessary to know their proper context, which can be known only after understanding the meaning of the remaining words in that sentence This is why in the Shastri method the dissolution of compounds and explanation of unknown words go on side by side.

If thus the interdependence of both these steps leads us to the clarification of the meaning of the whole sentence, it is in the fitness of things that both of them should be mixed together Nay, as the questioning alone in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति enables us to combine the stages of पदच्छेद and अन्वययोजना with the above two stages, the fourfold procedure of separating the Sandhis, construing, dissolving compounds and explaining unknown words goes on side by side in a *unified form. Questioning, then, is the* most important stage which facilitates the automatic separation of Sandhis in the same way in which it does the automatic dissolution of compounds Now, although 'the dissolution of compounds' and 'explanation of unknown words' are mixed together in the खण्डान्वय as well as in the दण्डान्वय, convenience of treatment obliges us here to devote individual attention to each of them

(iii) Dissolution of compounds—Sanskrit language is noted (not 'notorious', as some people wrongly suppose) for its compounds, which are decidedly of much help in securing brevity of expression As already remarked, the striking example of this brevity is found in the बहुव्रीहि compound into which a whole sentence can be compressed We must, however, acknowledge the fact that some Sanskrit authors being fond of elaborate and florid style have carried the tendency of using compounds to excess, and made their style highly artificial and obscure at the sacrifice of lucidity But this *particular fact does in no way permit one to*

generalize about the notoriety of the whole of Sanskrit literature for its compounds. दण्डिन् while treating of the गौडी style in contrast with the वैदर्भी or the best style, defines † ओजस्(vigour) as the profusion of compounds; and rhetoricians agree that super-abundance of compounds is the characteristic of the गौडी style.* Any way, students of Sanskrit literature must be conversant with compounds which, as indicated formerly, presuppose the knowledge of case-relations (कारक).

Pupils can be presumed to possess some knowledge of compounds through their study of poetry in the mother tongue. This knowledge can be turned to good account while teaching Sanskrit, and made more definite and exact by asking the pupils to study the समासचक्र,$ so that they themselves would be able to dissolve compounds without the aid of the teacher. Thinking that the समासचक्र serves all the practical needs of beginners, the Shastris value the applied knowledge of compounds more than mere theoretical knowledge, and give their pupils ample drill in recognizing and dissolving them in the proper context of literature.

† ओजः समासभूयस्त्वमेतद्गद्यस्य जीवितम् ।
पद्येऽप्यदाक्षिणात्यानामिदमेकं परायणम् ॥—काव्यादर्शः, १।८०

* ओजःप्रकाशकैर्वर्णैर्बन्ध आडम्बरः पुनः ।
समासबहुला गौडी......॥— साहित्यदर्पणः, ९।४

$ The distinguishing features of the main varieties of compounds with their examples and ways of dissolution are briefly but very clearly given in the समासचक्र as follows:—

In the case of a difficult and lengthy compound the Shastris themselves supply its literal meaning, which can *express in the mother tongue* all the विग्रह implied in that compound; and then they ask their pupils to use the corresponding विग्रह in Sanskrit. Here the Shastris say from a practical point of view that the length of a compound need not scare the pupils away, if the meanings of its several members are known. Their practical and useful hint for ascertaining the number of smaller compounds in a larger one is to ask the pupils to count all the words in the whole compound and then subtract the number 'One' from them. For instance, if a compound contains five words, the number of smaller compounds in it is generally four. Moreover, the Shastris show by precept and example how, while dissolving a larger compound, two components of it have to be taken each time, and how the preceding smaller member is to be connected with the following one.

(iv) *Explanation of words unknown to pupils:* At the initial stage the Shastris who follow the दण्डान्वयपद्धति generally use the mother tongue as the medium of instruction; and the more the pupils are advanced in understanding, the more they make use of the Sanskrit medium. It is then obvious that

---

चकारबहुलो द्वन्द्वः स चासौ कर्मधारयः ।
यस्य येषां बहुव्रीहिः शेषस्तत्पुरुषः स्मृतः ॥
वृक्षशाखा तत्पुरुषः श्वेताश्व. कर्मधारयः ।
रक्तवस्त्रो बहुव्रीहिर्द्वन्द्वश्चन्द्रदिवाकरौ ॥

at the elementary stage the meaning of every word unknown to the pupils is given by them in the mother tongue, at the intermediate stage simple Sanskrit equivalents are supplied along with their vernacular meanings and at the advanced stage the mother tongue being dispensed with, Sanskrit explanation is given in the manner of Sanskrit commentaries This, however, does not mean that the use of the mother tongue is totally banned at the advanced stage, or that all the Shastris without an exception employ the Sanskrit medium for higher teaching Still this *oral explanation in Sanskrit* trains the pupils in the ready recognition of the language heard establishes a 'direct bond between words and ideas, makes for the assimilation of Sanskrit and enlarges Sanskrit vocabulary Moreover the Sanskrit explanation paves the way for the study of Sanskrit commentaries the reading of which is generally recommended at the advanced stage by the Shastris with a view to initiating their pupils in the art of construing literary passages for themselves and thus training them in self help

Along with the vernacular or Sanskrit explanation, lines from the *Amara-Kosha* are quoted every now and then by the Shastris in order to show how several synonyms can be found for a particular word in the text These frequent quotations from the Amara-Kosha remind the pupils of the verses already learnt therein, show them how the 'अमर' can now be used intelligently in the proper context of the text, and help them to enrich their Sanskrit

vocabulary We may incidentally remark here that although the frequent quoting of the अमरकोश at the time of teaching literature greatly helps the pupils to memorize words in their context, *it is needless to burden the memory at least of average pupils* at their tender age with the learning of the *whole* of the अमरकोश, which is merely a collection of versified word-lists without any context. This learning of the अमरकोश is, even in the opinion of some learned Shastris, a wastage in education, as the major portion *of it is forgotten unless pupils get an opportunity* of studying a good deal of literature If we desire average pupils to use the अमरकोश with advantage, it would be expedient to introduce select verses from it in the context of literature, and recommend the use of an abridged *edition of it like* the अमरसार *of Prof Gole to* them for constant reference and memorizing

Some Shastris think that this explanation of individual words would not suffice, and in order to ensure clear understanding, they ask their pupils to give in a synthetic form the vernacular translation of a *verse* or a sentence This process of translating need not be considered much objectionable from the psychological point of view. For, even according to the New Method *occasional use of translation* is made to test the understanding of pupils As has been convincingly proved by H E. Palmer in 'The Scientific Study and Teaching of Languages', translation is not so 'indirect' as the staunch adherents of the Direct Method suppose.

On the contrary, it is more 'direct' than a more difficult Sanskrit synonym or paraphrase, and a vague, roundabout explanation in Sanskrit.$ Again, what is the use of explaining the word 'सरल:' by the word 'वृक्षविशेषः', 'चम्पकम्' by 'पुष्पविशेषः', 'मन.शिला' by 'धातुविशेषः' or 'कृकवाकुः' by 'पक्षिविशेषः', when the corresponding equivalents in the mother tongue are more apt and intelligible than the above? Even after taking into account all the merits of the Direct Method we find that *the establishment of the 'direct bond' is limited only to concrete objects, things or actions* Besides, in spite of the scrupulous avoidance of the mother tongue in the class, it is not possible for the teacher to prevent his pupils from mentally translating and thinking in the mother tongue what is spoken in the class, or from consulting an elderly person at home for vernacular equivalents or the translation of a Sanskrit passage It is, therefore, quite necessary, in the interest of pupils, to resort occasionally to 'translation into the mother tongue.' Experience also tells us that even though a Sanskrit passage be taught by the Translation Method, '*the direct bond' between Sanskrit words and ideas*

$ "Translation is a more direct mode of conveying the meaning of a unit than Definition, and *a fortiori*, more direct than context". p 88.

"The exclusion of translation as a regular means of conveying the meaning of units is an uneconomical and unnatural principle" p. 93

—'The Scientific Study and Teaching of Languages'
by H. E. Palmer.

in it can be established simply by asking the pupils to practise the loud and fluent reading of that passage for a number of times

There are, however, other reasons why the sole use of the Translation Method for language-teaching is open to objection In the adoption of the Translation Method in schools and colleges, it is, at present, the teacher who plays a more prominent part in the class-room than the pupils do. The teacher all the while translates literally the *sentences of a passage one after another, and the* pupils, having no scope for self-activity, either listen passively to what is said by the teacher, or take down what is dictated by him Excepting a few conscientious pupils the majority of them are either inattentive or sleepy Again, the quality of this translation is low, since little attention is paid in it to the felicity of expression or the idiom of the mother tongue All this procedure, being laborious and disgusting, is against psychology and the technique of teaching, both of which emphasize more self-activity on the part of the pupils We are thus faced by the new problem of group-teaching and class-management, to solve which, more effective methods must be adopted The खण्डान्वयपद्धति or 'The Question-and-answer Method', as we have already observed, is of great service in giving *full* play *to the activity of* pupils and in keeping them all alert and active in the class.

The plan of the Shastris to use the Sanskrit medium for teaching in a gradually increasing

proportion is we think, more natural than that of the Direct Methodists who employ the Sanskrit medium only at the elementary stage and recommend the use of the mother tongue at the advanced stage! Thus the Direct Method as practised at present in the teaching of Sanskrit is inadequate to the higher classes, where the Translation Method is mostly followed as an invariable alternative by the average teachers who feel diffident of using the Sanskrit medium *But the* खण्डान्वयपद्धति, *which unifies the two rival methods, viz, the Direct Method as well as the Translation Method, and incorporates all the best qualities of the old and new, or the Eastern and Western methods of teaching in an organized whole, is the only complete method embodying the 'eclectic' principle, and promises to be of immense advantage at the initial as well as the advanced stage of learning Sanskrit* A close study, therefore, of Sanskrit commentaries written according to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति is calculated to show the teachers of Sanskrit effective ways of supplying Sanskrit explanation through questions

(v) *Substance or purport of a sentence, paragraph or verse* (तात्पर्यम्): The fifth step actually followed by the Shastris in ' literature ' lessons is ' तात्पर्यकथन ' or the ' telling of the purport. ' This fifth step is psychologically and logically an essential step, since it sums up in a synthetic form what is taught in detail according to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति. In the adoption of the खण्डान्वयपद्धति as former-

ly treated of at length, the matter to be taught is, as it were, scattered on a wide area by the process of analysis through questions, and this circumstance might perhaps make a subject incomprehensible from the viewpoint of young learners. It must, however, be remembered that the method of खण्डान्वय is not simply an analytical process of separating a sentence into its component parts, but it is an *analytico-synthetic process* in which several analysed members of a sentence are combined through the *comprehension of the inter-relations of words* by means of the principles of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and सन्निधि, and at last, the students are led to the unified and comprehensive meaning or Purport (तात्पर्य) of a sentence or passage as a whole. In short, what is analysed by the खण्डान्वय is again synthesized by this Purport or Drift. This drift is generally *told* by the teacher in a sentence or two, but it may also be *elicited* from the pupils by asking questions according to the खण्डान्वय. Yet, in order to avoid too much of the monotony of the questioning process and to bring variety in teaching, it would be better for the teacher actually to *tell* the drift than ask questions on it. The drift is usually repeated twice at the beginning and end of a new 'thought-unit' (a sentence or passage). It is first stated in the form of an 'अवतरणिका' (introductory remark)† or

† The commentaries written by आनन्दगिरि on the भाष्यs of शङ्कराचार्य are generally in this form of अवतरणिकाs, which

प्रतिज्ञा, before presenting the details of a thought-unit, after which it is repeated for the second time at the close of that thought-unit. What is newly learnt is thus cemented by this repetition of the Purport: The purport that is told at the beginning in the form of 'प्रतिज्ञा' is again logically turned into 'निगमन' or conclusion at the end. This process goes on from the first step to the fifth and *vice versa* in a cyclic order, and presents a finished form to the teaching of that thought-unit. This repetition of the purport further creates the unified impression of a topic as a whole, and is psychologically sound in so far as it gives the idea of the 'whole', particularly in the अवतरणिका, before the learning of its parts. Modern psychology not only sanctions the learning, in general, of the *whole* before its *parts*, but combines the 'whole' and 'part' methods of learning into a Joint Method for a quick and ready recollection of the subjectmatter. Thus the method of खण्डान्वय and the function of तात्पर्य both together create the unified impression of a subject, aid memory by making for the assimilation of what is taught and lead to the mastery of the subject learnt.

XI THOUGHT AND LANGUAGE.

In connection with the तात्पर्यकथन it is necessary to understand the scientific meaning of 'तात्पर्यवृत्ति'

---

give synthetically the purport of the पद्धतिs of भाष्यs and facilitate clear understanding of the original.

as discussed by the Hindu schools of thought. But before dealing with the तात्पर्यवृत्ति it is essential to turn to the linguistic topics that are preliminary to its full understanding Those topics mainly relate to the nature of Speech, relation of thought and word, meaning of words in relation to objects, mutual connection of words in sentences, etc., and have been discussed in a hair-splitting manner with divergent views by the different Hindu schools of thought. The psychological implications of those views cannot be ignored, and the principles of language-learning contained in them can profitably be compared with the Western principles of language-learning A summary of those views has already occurred in this book;† yet, a more detailed treatment of them here is calculated to accentuate their *importance from the philosophical, psychological, linguistic and educational points of view.*

According to the Upanishadic philosophy, the energy (शक्ति) of the Intelligent Universal Self (परमात्मन्) changes by magic transformation (विवर्त) into the all pervading Sound essence (शब्दतत्त्व), which is symbolically called *OM*, and which is the source of all names and forms (नामरूप) of, the universe. * In other words, *the creative idea* or *thought* of the Universal Self gets itself transformed into this uni-

† See pp 118-120

* अनादिनिधन ब्रह्म शब्दतत्त्व यदक्षरम् ।
विवर्ततेऽर्थभावेन प्रक्रिया जगतो यतः ॥ वाक्यपदीयम् १।१

verse with its names (speech) and forms This creative idea or thought is further diversified through individual beings (जीव) into their individual thoughts or ideas, which are still further developed into their individual forms of speech, articulate and inarticulate In human beings Speech is articulate (वर्णात्मक), while in inanimate things and lower animals it is inarticulate (ध्वन्यात्मक) Thus all speech or sound is the incarnation of ओम्, the three syllables अ–उ–म् of which are, cosmically as well as individually indicative of the three states of wakefulness (जाग्रत्), dream (स्वप्न) and deep sleep (सुषुप्ति) respectively, through which all beings with their thoughts and speech have to pass In the beginning Speech lying motionless in union with the cosmic energy of परमात्मन् receives the name of परा वाक् This परा वाक् undergoes three stages or gradually developing forms of speech, namely, पश्यन्ती, मध्यमा and वैखरी, corresponding to सुषुप्ति, स्वप्न and जाग्रत्, which are, in their reverse order, the aforesaid three states experienced by beings. Thus Speech, which is originally one indivisible whole (ओम्) is, as it were, divided into four forms by the limitations of the three states of individuals The articulate speech that is used in all our daily affairs in the wakeful state is called 'वैखरी'. Before this वैखरी manifests itself and becomes articulate, it is identical with the idea or thought of the Universal Self or the Individual Self and is obviously the

incarnation of परा वाक्. In short, Speech is Thought itself in its developed form

From this metaphysical point of view 'thought' and 'speech' are not two distinct entities, but speech is identical with thought No relation can, therefore, be established between both of them except that of superimposition (अध्यास). But if from the phenomenal point of view speech is held for some time to be distinct from thought, then speech may be said to be the effect of thought which is the cause Thought and speech are thus inseparably connected with each other. In the वेदाङ्गशिक्षा the psycho-physical process of the development of speech from thought is described as follows —

"The Individual Self determines by his reasoning power the meanings (thought) to be expressed. With a desire to communicate them to others he impels his मनस् (mind) to action The mind makes its effort to push the internal heat (at the navel), which further impels the internal breath to rise. This internal breath after moving through the passage in the chest produces a low murmuring sound "* With all this internal effort the breath allied with a motive or purpose starts from the मूलाधार–centre of the body, where it is designated as 'परा वाक्' or speech of the unconscious level.

* आत्मा बुद्धया समेत्यार्थान् मनो युङ्क्ते विवक्षया। मनः कायाग्निमाहन्ति स प्रेरयति मारुतम्। मारुतस्तूरसि चरन्मन्द्रं जनयति स्वरम्॥
(वेदाङ्गशिक्षा, ६–७).

This breath rises up to the navel (नाभि) and is on the point of coming to the conscious level, when speech is called 'पश्यन्ती'. The same internal breath comes up to the chest (उरस्, हृदय), and being transformed into a distinct thought of the conscious level, it assumes the form of speech called 'मध्यमा'. This inaudible form of speech is indicative of the स्फोट (essence of speech) of the वैयाकरणs.† When the same breath reaches the glottis (कण्ठ) or mouth, the speech, which was thought itself at the former stage, is changed now into an audible sound (ध्वनि) which is termed 'वैखरी'.$ This वैखरी develops into human speech or language that is used in daily affairs. All languages on the earth are on a par with one another up to the limit of the 'मध्यमा' speech which consists of thought; but when they reach the level of वैखरी, they are diversified into languages of several countries. Human speech or language is, therefore, a developed form of वैखरी, and it consists of words combined into sentences according to a desired sequence. Really, the desire or purpose of the speaker himself comes into contact with the objects of the world and attaches meanings to words in relation to them. All words in language are,

---

† मध्यमानादोऽर्थवाचकस्फोटात्मकशब्दव्यञ्जकः। (परमलघुमञ्जूषा, ४).

$ परा वाङ् मूलचक्रस्था पश्यन्ती नाभिसंस्थिता। हृदिस्था मध्यमा ज्ञेया वैखरी कण्ठदेशगा॥ वैखर्या हि कृतो नादः परश्रवणगोचरः। मध्यमया कृतो नादः स्फोटव्यञ्जक उच्यते॥ (परमलघुमञ्जूषा, ४).

therefore, indicative of objects which are not apart from names and forms flashing forth from the Intelligent Self, and are inseparably associated with their meanings which are on the same level with thought A word, therefore, is a collection of sounds or letters, which, being the transformations of thought or motive, are produced in relation to objects according to a particular order by the internal effort of the speaker That words are permanently associated with their meanings or thoughts is a fact long ago recognized by the मीमांसकs The वैयाकरणs who uphold the theory of one indivisible वाक्यस्फोट establish eternal relation between thought and word * The नैयायिकs, however, say that words are non-eternal, and that Sound is a quality of the ether, though they are found to recognize that the relation between thought and word is conventional (सङ्केतात्मक). The linguistic principle that can be derived from all this is that *the motive or purpose of a speaker is understood by ascertaining the inseparable association of thought and word in relation to objects*

It will now be seen how the नैयायिकs and वैयाकरणs express, on the *psyochological basis,* their views about the relation of *a word to its meaning* A word is a collection of sounds (letters) arranged in a particular order *Single letters or syllables, how-*

* See the वार्तिक 'सिद्धे शब्दार्थसम्बन्धे' and the भाष्य thereon (पात. म. भाष्य. १)

ever, cannot convey a meaning unless they are combined into one whole to form a word. A word thus singnifies a person or object only when several syllables in it are unified. For instance, single letters like ग्रा–ह–क must be unified before they denote 'a child'; This unification, however, is not possible unless there is the simultaneous perception of all the letters of a word. This simultaneous perception is impossible, since the letters of a word are perceived by us one after another and vanish as soon as they are uttered or heard. Thus each syllable of a word, when uttered, lasts for a moment and hence there can be no unification or conjunction of all letters. But here the नैयायिक hold that *memory* helps the unification of letters into a word. They add that *the perception of the last syllable of a word, when it is associated with the recollected impressions of the immediately preceding syllables, gives synthetic form to a word, which then denotes an object and conveys sense according to convention* (सङ्केत). What they mean is that letters recalled and unified into a word by memory produce the sense of that word. Here an objection may be raised that even though the perception of the last syllable of a word is possible, there is no reason why *all* the preceding syllables should occur to the memory. It is probable that some letters will not be recollected; and even if it is supposed that all the preceding letters are recollected, we can simply say that memory helps us in recollecting *letters* and not in conveying

They either take only the physical (external) view of 'शब्द' or accept 'वर्णवाद' which embodies the principle that letters (वर्ण) are expressive of sense, though there are subtle differences among them as to whether 'शब्द' is eternal or non eternal If we look at the internal aspect of 'शब्द', we need not say that the स्फोटवादिन्s are very far from truth, since their स्फोट can be identified with the मध्यमा-speech of the प्रणव (ओम्) propounded by the Upanishads But शङ्कराचार्य, who sides with the वर्णवादिन्s thinks that the theory of स्फोट is superfluous and complicated Quoting the opinion of उपवर्ष, an ancient मीमांसक and वेदान्तिन्, he has refuted the theory of स्फोट in his illuminating भाष्य (ब्र सू १ ३ २८) and psychologically explained the relation between thought and word by establishing that letters can convey sense . A summary of his arguments will not be out of place here. He says as follows—

A word is not the स्फोट but it is a group of letters (वर्ण) That the letters क, ख and others vanish as soon as they are uttered is a false notion. For, we have always the experience ' I repeat the same letter 'क' that I uttered before ' This experience is proved to be true in respect of every letter and it is called 'recognition' (प्रत्यभिज्ञा) This experience is not based upon likeness, since we do not say ' This letter क is like that letter क' but say ' This is the same letter that I uttered before ' The experience of recognition is based upon the identity of

past and present experiences and not upon likeness Again, this recognition relates itself to the individual letters क, ख and others and not to their class-notion (कत्व, खत्व, etc), for difference among individuals along with their similarity should be seen before they can be included in a class As only identity of letters is recognized by us instead of their difference, we must conclude that we have the recognition of individual letters and not of their class For instance, when we repeat the same word 'गौ', it is said that the word 'गौ' has been repeated twice and not that two words 'गौ' are repeated If any differnce is observed among individual letters क, ख, etc, it is due to the external influences such as voice, pronunciation, accentuation, etc, and not due to the innate nature of letters The recognition that the same letters are uttered is due to the inherent nature of individual letters themselves As sense can be gathered from a group of such letters, it is unnecessary to postulate the theory of स्फोट.

If it is said that the sense in the form of स्फोट flashes out suddenly in the mind after it has received impressions left by the perception of single letters it may be replied that this is the *synthetic activity of the mind* (समस्तप्रत्ययमर्शिनी बुद्धि) that is also connected with letters For, after each letter of the word 'गौ' [ग्+औ+] has been perceived in succession, the synthetic power of the mind forms collectively a single concept which is connected with the aggregate of letters and not

with स्फोट. As this unifying mental activity refers only to letters, it cannot be an indication to prove the existence of स्फोट which is different from letters. For instance, when the word 'गौ' is desired to be spoken, only the letters ग् and others occur to the mind, and the letters द् and others of a word which is not desired to be spoken do not occur If the object of cognition for the unifying activity of the mind is स्फोट which is different from the letters ग् and others; then there is no reason for ग् and others to occur to the mind, just as there is no reason for a word beginning with द् to occur, when a word beginning with ग् is desired to be spoken. But this does not happen. Hence the synthetic mental activity which refers to the aggregate of letters is not about स्फोट, but is only a recollection connected with the letters Again, it is also possible for the different letters of a word to become the object of a single concept, as in the case of words like पङ्क्ति (row), वन (forest), सेना (army) and others The collective sense of each of these words is understood by the synthetic mental activity, though each one contains several individual things or members (i e trees, soldiers) The same unifying mental activity forms an aggregate of the different letters contained in a word

One would object to this that if only letters combined into an aggregate to form a word would become an object of a single concept, there would be no difference between words like 'कपि' (ape)

and 'पिक' (cuckoo) on account of the occurrence of the same letters. But it may here be explained that though the aggregate of letters (of a word) would be the object of cognition to the mind, yet those letters would occur to the synthetic mental activity according to their *desired sequence* in that word, just as ants going one after another give us the idea of a row. Although the letters in a word would, perhaps, be the same, the particular sequence of them would help us to differentiate one word from another. The usage of elders (वृद्धव्यवहार) has established that when letters with a particular number are grouped and arranged in a particular sequence, they should be associated with a particular meaning; and when a child begins to learn a language, those letters, though they are perceived singly one after another, are similarly unified by his (or her) synthetic mental activity into different words, which invariably convey particular meanings according to the predetermined sequence and number of letters. This process of understanding the sense from letters, as propounded by the वर्णवादिन्s, is simpler than that propounded by the वैयाकरणs on the basis of the theory of स्फोट. Thus शङ्कराचार्य concludes his भाष्य by saying that in the hypothesis of स्फोट there is a negation of facts that are actually perceived (दृष्टहानि) and an assumption of what is not perceived (अदृष्टकल्पना). That letters uttered in succession reveal the 'स्फोट' and that this स्फोट again reveals the sense

is a far-fetched and complicated idea involving the fault of 'गौरव'.

The most important point to be noted in the foregoing summary of the भाष्य is that the unification of single letters into aggregates (words) is made by our *synthetic mental activity* (समस्तप्रत्ययमर्शिनी बुद्धिः) and that the meaning arises from such words in relation to things in the universe. This synthetic mental activity is continuously engaged in unifying letters into words, words into sentences, sentences into paragraphs, etc., and helps us to give the connected sense of a passage or a book also. This mental activity which is a reflection of Pure Consciousness (चैतन्य) assumes a particular state (वृत्ति) in relation to a particular word, just as it does with objects, and retains that mental state with regard to a particular word as long as it has not given rise to another state with regard to another word. In other words, the span of this mental state lasts till another state different from it has arisen,* and the cognition of words, sentences, etc., in their synthetic form is made possible, though they are uttered or written one after another Another important fact to be noted in the भाष्य is that in the process of learning a language शङ्कराचार्य recognizes *the prominent place occupied by the usage of elders* (वृद्धव्यवहार), which is held by नागेश, the celebrated grammarian, to be the chief of all the

* ···अन्तःकरणवृत्तिरेकैव, न तु नाना, वृत्तेः स्वविरोधिवृत्त्युत्पत्तिपर्यन्तं स्थायित्वाभ्युपगमात्। (वेदान्तपरिभाषा, १).

ways of learning the meanings of words (शक्तिग्राहक-शिरोमणि). †

XII. THE UNIT OF LANGUAGE—a sentence or a word.

(अन्विताभिधानवाद and अभिहितान्वयवाद)

The reason, why the usage of elders or popular usage (वृद्धव्यवहार, लोकव्यवहार) is held to be so very important among the eight modes of language-learning (See p. 119), is that when a child first *begins to learn a language, it is only the actual use* of it by elders in daily life that counts for much; while grammar, dictionaries, commentaries, etc., do not help a child in determining the senses of words, since they are beyond its capacity. In the case of a child the *psychological process of understanding the meanings of words,* according to the popular usage, takes place as follows:—

An elderly person ordering another elderly person (a servant, junior) says 'देवदत्त, गामानय' (Oh देवदत्त, bring a cow). The second elderly person, who hears this sentence, performs the action of bringing the cow. A boy who sits near *hears* the same sentence and *observes* that the cow has been brought. The boy then *infers* that since the second elderly person performed the action of bringing

---

† सा च शक्तिः साधुष्विवासाधुष्वपि, शक्तिग्राहकशिरोमणेर्व्यवहारस्य तुल्यत्वात्। —परमलघुमञ्जूषा, पृ. १.

the cow after understanding the meaning of the command, the words (i e the sentence) 'गामानय' must be related to that action He thus broadly concludes that the meaning of the action of bringing the cow must be the meaning of the sentence 'गामानय'. Again, the boy hears the first elderly person saying to the second, 'गां बधान' (Tie the cow), and observing that the cow has been tied accordingly, he infers that the sense of tying the cow must be the sense of the sentence, 'गां बधान'. This is how he understands *broad senses of words as combined in sentences* He again hears the first elderly person saying to the second, 'अश्वमानय' (Bring a horse), and observing the action of bringing the horse, he infers that the words in the sentence 'अश्वमानय' are related to the said action as before After hearing these sentences he naturally begins to compare them He then finds that in the sentences 'गामानय' and 'गां बधान' one word 'गाम्' is common, and that the beast brought and tied is also common Then by the mental process of *inclusion and exclusion* (आवापोद्वाप–अन्वयव्यतिरेक) he excludes the individual words आनय and बधान, and takes the common word गाम् to mean 'a cow'. Thus a *direct bond* (relation) between the word गाम् and the beast 'cow' being established in his mind, he understands the meaning of that individual word Similarly by the comparison of the sentences 'गामानय' and 'अश्वमानय' and by the process of inclusion and exclusion (अन्वयव्यतिरेक) he finds that

the word 'आनय', which is common, was repeated twice in connection with the same action of bringing, and concludes that 'आनय' must mean 'Bring'. This is generally the process by which a child learns to speak.* Here the child understands the senses of individual words, only when they are *combined in sentences* and not independently of any context or relation.

As the meaning of a word is understood only in relation to the other words or context of a connected sentence, the process of learning a language by popular usage is otherwise called 'अन्विताभिधान' † (expression of the connected), and the प्राभाकरमीमांसकs, who propound this theory of अन्विताभिधान, are called अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s. The अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s say that the सङ्केत or शक्ति (*convention, power*) that such and such a word should have such and such a sense, is understood through the *connected sense* of a sentence and in relation to an object, person or action also. Hence, according to the अन्विताभिधानवाद *a sentence is the unit of language* and not an independent word. The नैयायिकs and आलङ्कारिकs have recognized this theory of अन्विताभिधान as a mode of learning the significance of words, though they do not lend complete support to it. The वेदान्तिन्s, as referred to above, give due importance to the

* See pp. 60-61.

† अन्वितानामेव अर्थान्तरसम्बद्धानामेव पदार्थानामभिधानं शब्दैः प्रतिपादनम्।

usage of elders and the वैयाकरण्s call it 'शक्तिग्राहकशिरोमणि' (the foremost among the modes of knowing the meaning) The वैयाकरण्s do not recognize the existence of a word as apart from the indivisible sense (अखण्डार्थ) of a sentence (वाक्यस्फोट) i e, they think that a word is unreal with reference to the word essence (स्फोट) which is real while the अन्विताभिधान-वादिन्s recognize the separate existence of a word as a part of a sentence Yet they lay more stress on the *construed meaning* (अन्विताभिधान) of a sentence than on the individual meaning of a word Hence according to the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s it is first the sentence that is understood in its connected form and then its constituent words As in popular usage a child understands connected sentences before understanding their separate words a sentence is the unit of thought and speech according to the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s It will thus be found that in spite of their mutual difference as regards the position of a word in a sentence, the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s and the वैयाकरण्s seem to hold that *a sentence is the unit of language* and both of them recommend *the usage of elders or the actual use of a language as a superior way of teaching the meanings of words This principle closely corresponds to the Direct Method of the West*

As described above, a child subconsciously undergoes the detailed process of hearing, observation, inference, understanding the connected sense of individual words and the establishment of

a direct bond between a word and an object, person, etc, in their due order; and this process being thoroughly *psychological* is in complete harmony with the modern psychology and linguistic principles. The child here learns a language without being conscious of the fact that it learns. According to the Western principles of language-study † a child possesses, in a high degree, *natural or spontaneous capacities* for acquiring speech. It is not only the mother tongue but other languages also (even a classical language) that can be learnt by means of the natural capacities for the imitation of elders and sub-conscious assimilation of language units *Studial capacities* for learning languages are not natural but can be acquired by conscious practice, when a child is ripened in age and understanding. This is the reason why grammar, dictionaries, and commentaries can be used for learning a language only at the advanced stage. To make exclusive use of studial capacities in language-learning from the beginning is an unnatural process Language-learning must, therefore, begin with the use of *natural capacities*, which may, at the advanced stage, be *supplemented by studial capacities*. The studial capacities then make it possible for the teacher to lay down a *corrective course* for eradicating bad habits of speech and writing and for developing good ones. It will thus be found that the Eastern and Western thinkers are at one in laying due *stress on the*

† Read 'The Principles of Language-Study' by H E. Palmer.

usage of elders, and that the actual use of language in its association with objects, persons, etc., was *recognized long ago by the Eastern thinkers* as an effective means of language-learning. For this reason the Direct Method of teaching Sanskrit to young pupils should not be regarded as an innovation, and the efficacy of teaching new Sanskrit words in the context of connected Sanskrit sentences need not be doubted.

Now the प्राभाकरमीमांसकs hold that *a verb is the principal word in a sentence* and that the remaining words in the sentence possess a meaning only in relation to the action (क्रिया) denoted by the verb; in other words, the remaining words have a कारक-relation to the verb. Then the construed meaning of the sentence not being something different from the expressed meanings of several constituent words, there is no necessity of postulating a separate function called तात्पर्य as has been done by the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s. They, moreover, say that the usage of elders being mostly concerned with injunctions or something to be done (कार्य), only those sentences which contain commands (विधिपर, कार्यपर), i. e., sentences like 'गामानय', 'अश्वं बधान' containing verbs in लोट् (imperative), लिङ् (potential), etc., can convey a legitimate meaning; while the assertive sentences which are mere statements of fact (सिद्धवाक्यs) or which do not signify something to be done are अर्थवादs and cannot convey any meaning independently of a विधिवाक्य. This view is, according

to the नैयायिक and वेदान्तिन्, not correct. For, even सिद्धवाक्य like 'चैत्र, पुत्रस्ते जात.' (Oh चैत्र, a son has been born to you), 'कन्या ते गर्भिणी जाता' (Your unmarried daughter has conceived) are independent and significant enough in gladdening or saddening the person addressed. Leaving aside the implications of these divergent views of the मीमांसक and वेदान्तिन्, we can derive from this a linguistic principle that connected sentences used in conversational lessons based on वृद्धव्यवहार can be in any mood, indicative, imperative or potential, and can equally convey independent meanings. Again, as assertive sentences (सिद्धवाक्य) like 'कान्च्या त्रिभुवन तिलको भूपतिः', 'जय काला' etc, are significant enough in the absence of verbs, sentences without verbs can also be used in conversational lessons without loss of meaning

Again, the प्रामाकरमीमांसक say that every sentence is composed of two portions (अंश) Of them the first portion is the constituent words and the second is their mutual relation which is called 'construction' (अन्वय, संसर्ग). It is, therefore, as much necessary to understand the signification or power (शक्ति) of the portion of अन्वय, as that of the portion of constituent words For, if we shall understand simply the signification (शक्ति) of individual words, then we shall be at a loss to understand their mutual relation It is, therefore, essential to comprehend the signification of the portion of relation (अन्वयांश) also.

But the नैयायिकs along with the भाट्टमीमांसक्s take a different view of the matter. It is somewhat true, they say, that according to the usage of elders a child begins to learn the meanings of individual words through the connected sense of a sentence, and that the context of a sentence often helps us to understand the meaning of a word Yet during the further stages of the learning process the child is able to understand the signification of a word in isolation or bereft of its relation to a sentence. According as he advances in understanding, he comes to know that single words exist independently in language and their meanings can be known from *dictionaries*, reliable persons (आप्त) etc If it is supposed, say the नैयायिकs and the भाट्टमीमांसक्s, that there are no independent words having separate meanings in language, we shall not be able to classify them into different parts of speech Again, while reading a book or hearing a speech, sentences become unintelligible, if individual words in them are not known. The meanings of sentences are thoroughly understood only when the definite meanings of difficult words in them are known from a dictionary, though the general meanings of words in dictionaries are modified a little in the context of sentences in a book. Even our former knowledge of *individual* words helps us to understand any new matter. Again, for supplying explanations, oral or written (commentaries), particular words or phrases are selected more than others, although their general senses are to be made

specific to suit the context Similarly etymological explanations are supplied only in the case of detached words and not in the case of a sentence All these instances show that words are taken by us to have general, unconnected senses. It is then the individual senses of separate words in language that must first be expressed (अभिहित) and known, and then their construction or combination (अन्वय) into a sentence would be in'elligible Thus the theory advocating the synthesis (अन्वय) of the senses of unconnected words in the form of a sentence is called अभिहितान्वयवाद* (connection of the expressed), and the भाट्टमीमांसकs as well as the नैयायिकs who uphold it are designated as अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s.

According to the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, then, detached words in language posse*s individua' mean ings which are conveyed by the वृत्तिs (functions of words) called अभिधा (Expression) and लक्षणा (Implication) Yet, if several independent words like 'गौरश्व पुरुषो हस्ती' are merely put together without any relation (अन्वय), they do not convey anything beyond denoting the meaning of each individual word As soon as each of these words is uttered or read, its expressive power (शक्ति) after doing it's work is exhausted and does not lead us further As there is no mutual relation between the words 'गौरश्व पुरुषो हस्ती', they do not convey any

---

* अभिहितानां पदार्थानां अर्थाभिधायिनां वा पदानामन्वय इति वादः ।

unified sense of a sentence. This unified sense in the form of a sentence arises, when the general meanings of detached words mutually bear a relation (अन्वय), which is established by Expectancy (आकाङ्क्षा), Consistency (योग्यता), and Contiguity (संनिधि), as formerly treated of at length. This new or additional sense, which results from the correlation of individual senses, is not only a totality of them, but something more than that totality. It then assumes a peculiar shape (विशेषवपुः) and is distinct from the individual senses of words (अपदार्थ).† The individual senses, which then become the constituents, are modified and subordinated to this *principal sense of a sentence. The independent* meanings of words thus becoming dependent are turned into relational ones and subserve the unified meaning, which is called the sense of a sentence (वाक्यार्थ) or the purport (तात्पर्यार्थ), and which is conveyed by a separate function called तात्पर्यवृत्ति. If, therefore, the correlation (संसर्ग, अन्वय) of *significant* words themselves is the connected sense of a sentence, and if that correlation can be automatically established by means of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and संनिधि, it is sufficient for us, say the अभिहितान्वय-वादिन्‌s, simply to understand the signification (शक्ति) of constituent words, and it is unnecessary to

† आकाङ्क्षायोग्यतासंनिधिवशात्पदार्थानां समन्वये तात्पर्यार्थो विशेष-वपुरपदार्थोऽपि वाक्यार्थः समुल्लसतीत्यभिहितान्वयवादिनां मतम् ।

—काव्यप्रकाशः, २।६.

postulate a separate signification of the portion of 'relation' (अन्वयार्थ), as the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s do.

It may here be remarked that the views of both the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s and अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, as detailed above, contain *partial truth*. Although neither of them is absolutely true or superior to the other, each of them is correct and useful from its own standpoint. If the aspect of the precedence of a sentence in language-learning is taken into account, the view of the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s is much plausible. For, when a child begins to speak, it assimilates language and *thinks* in the form of a *connected sentence* rather than in that of disconnected words, though it may express itself in single words for want of sufficient vocabulary. In order to encourage and develop this natural capacity of a child to assimilate language, the teacher will have to resort to the view of the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s, who lay more stress on the aspect of a connected sentence than on that of words. This is how *the conversational method of teaching Sanskrit at the beginner's stage finds full support in the theory of the* अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s. But the theory of the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s does not seem to be absolutely true, when the aspect of the independent existence of significant words (पद) in language, as shown by the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, is taken into consideration. There is some truth in the view of the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s also. For, when the pupils reach the advanced stage of language-learning, they begin to realize

that words in language exist apart from their context of a *sentence also*, and they learn their individual meanings from different sources like dictionaries, oral explanations, *written explanations* (commentaries) and others It will thus be found that *the principle of* अभिहितान्वय *is useful particularly at the advanced stage of language-learning*, and that the conversational method, based on the relatively correct principle of अन्विताभिधान, has its own limitations, though it is at the beginning the natural method *calculated to create* a proper attitude towards Sanskrit At the advanced stage too when the context of a connected sentence determines the meaning of a particular word in it, the principle of अन्विताभिधान is occasionally useful. But the principle of अभिहितान्वय, that detached words are unified into the special sense of a sentence by the process *of construing* (अन्वय), *is more useful* at the advanced stage than that of अन्विताभिधान, since the pupils by that time are able to recognize different parts of speech as well as their distinction from a sentence (unified sense), and are expected to have developed their studial capacity for consciously learning isolated forms of words through grammar (व्याकरण), dictionaries (कोश), commentaries (*विवृति*), etc.

Though the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s and the अभिहितान्वय वादिन्s differ from each other as regards their approach to language, they are at one in recognizing the principle of अन्वय. As the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s, however, say that a *sentence expresses itself only*

in its *construed* (अन्वित) form, they are not required to resort to the separate process of correlation or construing (अन्वय) of different words into a sentence as the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s do The process of construing, specially advocated by the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, further develops into the two distinct modes of दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय, which have been formerly dealt with in detail. Since those two methods of construing (दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय) have received the form of a permanent record in the *Sanskrit* commentaries on Sanskrit classics, their oral use in actual teaching must have long preceded the commentary literature and must have been current in ancient times. It may thus be said that the methods of दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय are based more on the linguistic theory of अभिहितान्वय than on that of अन्विताभिधान.

In contrast with the अखण्डवाक्यार्थवादिन्s (स्फोटवादिन्s) the मीमांसक्s and the नैयायिक्s are 'खण्डवाक्यार्थवादिन्s', for, according to them a sentence is capable of being resolved into several parts Of these खण्डवाक्यार्थवादिन्s, the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s (भाट्टमीमांसक्s and नैयायिक्s) say that separate words, which form a sentence, can be construed and re-arranged in their proper order for the easy understanding of their connected meaning So the views of the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s seem to have played a prominent part in the development of the methods of दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय As the नैयायिक्s hold the 'subject' to be the principal word in a sentence, the method of

दण्डान्वय is akin to their process of understanding the meaning of a sentence $ On the other hand, though the मीमांसक्s in general take the verbal form to be the main word in a sentence, $ the views of the भाट्टमीमांसक (अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s) might have particularly led to give a fixed and organized form to the method of खण्डान्वय, since only the भाट्टs are found to recognize the existence of single (detached) words and their construing Against these खण्डवाक्यार्थवादिन्s there are the स्फोटवादिन्s who are called 'अखण्डवाक्यार्थवादिन्s,' because according to them a sentence is an indivisible whole According to their view there is no scope for the construing of words, as a sentence cannot be divided into parts They again think that only the indivisible वाक्यस्फोट is real, and that the disintegration (अपोद्धार) of a sentence into words, or of words into crude forms (प्रकृति) and affixes (प्रत्यय) is an unreal process resorted to for the understanding of unintelligent people If they are thus found to adopt, against their main tenet, the imaginary process of analysis for the sake of children, there is no reason why, according to them, even the imaginary process of synthesis or construing (अन्वय) should not be adopted The वैयाकरणs may, therefore, be taken in this particular

$ For instance, the नैयायिक्s understand the sentence 'देवदत्तस्तण्डुलं पचति' as 'तण्डुलकर्मक–पाकानुकूलकृत्य नयो देवदत्त.' and the मीमांसक्s understand the same as 'देवदत्तकर्तृक–तण्डुल–कर्मक–पाकक्रिया'

sense to be favourable to the methods of construing, which facilitate understanding. Thus the recognition of significant and separate words in language and their combination into a sentence by the process of खण्डान्वय and दण्डान्वय for the purpose of expressing an additional sense or purport (तात्पर्य) are both of them *an analytico-synthetic process* adopted by the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s.

It will then be found that the views of the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s as well as of the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s are relatively true, and that *the parts of truth contained in both of them can be amalgamated for fixing a graded course in language-teaching.* As indicated above, the view of the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s sanctions, according to the usage of elders (वृद्धव्यवहार), the conversational or oral method, which is to be adopted particularly at the initial stage of teaching Sanskrit; while the view of the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, who lay down the principles and methods of construing, will be of great help in teaching at the advanced stage, when the pupils have learnt to read and write that language. It has already been seen that the natural capacities, which can be utilized in the *oral* teaching of language, do not suffice when boys begin to *read* and *write*. Reading, writing (dictation, composition, translation, etc.), analysis, synthesis, conjugation and declension require studial capacities, which can be developed by making use of intelligence, *eyes* and hands in addition to ears. At

the first stage, therefore, sufficient scope for *hearing, imitating* and *reproducing* language, all of which require natural capacities for assimilation, may be given, yet *these natural capacities must be gradually assisted by studial capacities, if an all-round course in language-teaching, following the linguistic principles of 'Gradation', 'Proportion', 'Rational Order of Progression' and 'Multiple Line of Approach',* is to be prepared* The methods of दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय, which require the use of studial capacities, are expected to give a finished and graded form to the Sanskrit course It has formerly been shown in detail that the method of खण्डान्वय, which is based on the principles of अभिहितान्वयवाद, is far superior to that of दण्डान्वय, since it is a psychological method making a prominent use of questions and answers Question-and-answer work being an important feature of the Conversational or Direct Method, the method of खण्डान्वय has been found to bear much resemblance to it. Thus *the oral use of the method of खण्डान्वय for teaching Sanskrit at the advanced stage will be a natural growth of the Conversational Method, which is based on the वृद्धव्यवहार of the अन्विताभिधानवादिनः and which is to be utilized at the elementary stage This combination (समुच्चय) of the theories of अन्विताभिधान and अभिहितान्वय is calculated to prove very beneficial to the practice of Sanskrit teaching,* which will thus be based on the Eastern

*Read 'The Principles of Language-Study,' by H E. Palmer.

linguistic principles gradually evolved from the peculiar nature and structure of Sanskrit language. Moreover, the Eastern linguistic principles and methods finding their parallels in those of the West, will stand the test of the modern scientific methods of language-teaching. It may be remarked in passing that the above combination (समुच्चय) of अन्विताभिधान and अभिहितान्वय is not an innovation; for such समुच्चयवादिन्s, as referred to by 'मुकुल' in his 'अभिधावृत्तिमातृका', seem to have already existed in ancient times. †

XIII. EXPRESSION (अभिधा).

It will now be opportune to see how the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, after accepting the independent existence of words in language, explain their individual significance. Among them the नैयायिक्s, while dealing with the *psychological process* of the comprehension of words, say that mere words in language are not the cause of verbal comprehension. In the first place, the perception of a word must take place; i. e., a word spoken or written must be

† अन्येषां तु मते पदानां तत्तत्सामान्यभूतो वाच्योऽर्थः । वाक्यस्य तु परस्परान्विताः पदार्था इति पदापेक्षयाभिहितान्वयः, वाक्यापेक्षया त्वन्विताभिधानम् । एवं चैतयोरभिहितान्वयान्विताभिधानयोः समुच्चय इति ॥

— अभिधावृत्तिमातृका, कारिका ७,८

actually heard or read. Secondly, we must possess the knowledge of शक्ति or the inherent power of a word to facilitate the memory of a certain meaning *; i. e., we must be aware of the convention (सङ्केत) that such and such a word should denote such and such a meaning † Thirdly, this knowledge of शक्ति or सङ्केत leads, through the association of words, to the recollection of meaning in relation to objects. Now *the law of mental association* is that if one out of two related things is seen, it naturally reminds us of the other thing related to it $ For example, if a man knows the relation of 'the served and the servant' (सेव्यसेवकसम्बन्ध) between an elephant and an elephant-driver respectively, he will be reminded of the other, in case he comes in sight of one of them. As in the present case a word and its meaning are two related things, the knowledge of the power (शक्ति) of a word immediately reminds us of its meaning, which is related to an object. This recollection of meaning by association takes place through 'वृत्ति' or significatory function, which is a conventional relation between a word and an object (the idea of an object, i. e, the meaning) signified by it. For instance, if the word 'घट' (jar) is known, it awakens, when uttered, the memory of the object 'घट' (i. e. the meaning) through the conventional

* अर्थस्मृत्यनुकूलः पदपदार्थसम्बन्धः शक्तिः । (तर्कदीपिका).

† अस्मात्पदादयमर्थो बोद्धव्य इतीश्वरसङ्केतः शक्तिः । (तर्कसङ्ग्रहः).

$ एकसम्बन्धिज्ञानमपरसम्बन्धिस्मारकमिति न्यायात् ।

relation (वृत्ति) established between the word 'घट' and the object 'घट'. In short, the instrument of verbal comprehension is the knowledge of a word, the intermediate mental action in it is the recollection of the sense (the idea of an object) of that word, its auxiliary is the knowledge of the denotative power of a word, and the result is the verbal knowledge in relation to an object.* Now the relation (वृत्ति) of a word to its meaning is, according to the नैयायिकs, of two kinds, viz., शक्ति or अभिधा (Expression) and लक्षणा (Implication); while according to the आलङ्कारिकs it is of three kinds, viz, अभिधा, लक्षणा and व्यञ्जना (Suggestion). Of these the direct or conventional relation between a word and its meaning leading to the immediate comprehension of the *primary* sense is called 'शक्ति' or 'अभिधा'. For example, the word 'घट' directly expresses a particular object with a shape having a large bottom, body, etc.† Hence this *direct relation* between the word 'घट' and the object signified by it is called शक्ति, सङ्केत or अभिधा. Since the meaning of a word is contained in its *relation* to the object signified, the meaning recollected by the help of शक्ति (inherent power) being primary (मुख्य) is termed 'शक्य' (what is denoted by शक्ति) or 'वाच्य' (the expressed), and the word

---

* पदज्ञानं तु करणं द्वारं तत्र पदार्थधीः । शाब्दबोधः फलं तत्र शक्तिधीः सहकारिणी ॥ —भाषापरिच्छेदः, ८१

† शक्तिर्नाम पदानामर्थेषु मुख्या वृत्तिः । यथा घटपदस्य पृथुबुध्नोदराद्याकृतिविशिष्टे वस्तुविशेषे वृत्तिः । (वेदान्तपरिभाषा, ४).

having such a meaning is designated as 'शक्त' (having the power to express) or 'वाचक' (expressive).

There are divergent views among the Hindu schools of thought about the question whether the वृत्ति *called* 'शक्ति' or 'अभिधा', *i. e., the power or* convention (सङ्केत) of a word, is concerned with a class (जाति) or an individual (व्यक्ति). The नव्यनैयायिकs and साङ्ख्यs, who are 'केवलव्यक्तिवादिन्s', think that the convention of a word should be understood with reference to an individual (व्यक्ति), since it is the individual (a concrete substance or form) alone that can become the object of sense-perception (sound, touch, colour, taste and smell) and practical activity, and not the class or genus (जाति). For, when we say 'गामानय', we refer to the individual 'गौः' (cow) and not to 'गोत्व' (cowness) as 'गोत्व' cannot be the object of the practical activity of bringing, milking, etc. (अर्थक्रियाकारित्व). Similarly, in sentences like 'This is a flower', 'This is a book', etc., we do not refer to their class but to the individual.

The मीमांसकs object to this theory of individual *denotation* (केवलव्यक्तिवाद), *and say that it is the genus* (जाति) that is denoted by a word and not an individual. Firstly, if the convention of the word 'गौः' would be understood with respect to *all* individual cows, the fault of endlessness (आनन्त्य) would occur. As the individuals are numberless, it is impossible for us to understand the convention or power of the word 'गौः' with reference to *all* of them at

the same time. We shall, in that case, have to use as many different words as there are cows on the earth; and those words being distinct from one another, we shall have to understand the convention of each of those words separately. This is against our actual experience that one word should denote one primary sense. Thus the convention of a word cannot be understood with reference to *all* individuals. Secondly, if it is supposed that the convention of a word can be understood with regard to *one* individual or *some* individuals, the fault of violation (व्यभिचार) occurs. In other words, the rule that a word denotes that sense alone in regard to which a convention is known, is violated. For instance, if we shall understand the convention of the word 'गौः' with reference to 'a *white* cow' we shall not be able to understand the same convention with reference to '*a black cow*' i.e., the black cow will have to be excluded from the said convention (सङ्केताविषय), just as a jar (घट) cannot be the object of that convention. This leads us to the fault of violation (व्यभिचार), which occurs when we understand the convention with respect to *one* individual or *some* individuals. The convention of the word 'गौः' is, however, usually understood by us with regard to *any* cow, white, black or tawny. In other words, we actually apply the word 'गौः' to a white as well as a black cow without distinction, though no special convention is made regarding the black cow. *Thirdly*, if we suppose that words denote individuals alone, the words

'गौ शुक्लश्चलो डित्थ' being used with respect to one and the same individual, would be synonymous, i e, the scope of those words as nouns, adjectives, verbs, etc, not being distinct, the objects denoted by them would not be differentiated, and such synonymous words would not form a complete sentence It must, therefore be concluded, say the मीमांसक's, that the convention or power of a word must be understood in respect of the genus or class (जाति), which is the attribute (उपाधि) of an individual † As the genus is the common property 'residing in similar individuals, it gives us a comprehensive knowledge of several things that possess this common property or attribute The genus is, therefore one eternal property among non-eternal things What is then meant by the word 'गौ' is not the particular 'गौ' but the common attribute or property 'गोत्व' which resides in all cows If it is objected that 'जाति' (गोत्व, घटत्व, etc) cannot be brought for practical purposes, but the individual 'गोव्यक्ति' can be brought, the मीमांसक's say that the individual (व्यक्ति) can be understood by implication (आक्षेप, लक्षणा), as the individual is inseparably connected with its class (जाति) According to the मीमांसक's therefore, it is the genus or class (जाति) that is

† यद्यप्यर्थक्रियाकारितया प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तियोग्या व्यक्तिरेव, तथाप्यानन्त्याद्व्यभिचाराच्च तत्र सङ्केत कर्तुं न युज्यत इति, गौ शुक्लश्चलो डित्थ इत्यादीनां शब्दानां विषयविभागो न प्राप्नोतीति तदुपाधावेव सङ्केत ।

—काव्यप्रकाश, उ. २.

primarily understood by the convention of a word, the individual being known *secondarily* (लक्षणया). Thus the word 'गौः' primarily means 'गोत्व' (the common property 'cowness') and secondarily the individual 'गौः' (cow).

The मीमांसकs and the वैयाकरणs agree in holding the view that convention can be understood with reference to the genus (जाति) which is an attribute (उपाधि) of an individual, though they differ as regards the number of उपाधिs. The मीमांसकs, who are केवलजातिवादिन्s, regard mere जाति as the attribute of an individual, in respect of which (जाति) the convention of a word is established; while the वैयाकरणs, who are जात्यादिवादिन्s, say that the convention of a word is to be understood with regard to the four attributes of an individual, viz., जाति, गुण, क्रिया and संज्ञा or यदृच्छा, as words in language can be divided into four groups.§ Again, while discussing whether the sense of a word is जाति (आकृति) or व्यक्ति (द्रव्य) पतञ्जलि says on the basis of पाणिनि's सूत्रs that the sense of a word is both जाति and व्यक्ति.$ Out of the four attributes mentioned above 'जाति' (genus) is an attribute which being inherent in a thing gives life to it. For

§ चतुष्टयी शब्दानां प्रवृत्तिः । जातिशब्दाः गुणशब्दाः क्रियाशब्दा यदृच्छाशब्दाश्चतुर्थाः । पतं. महाभाष्यम्, आ. २, सूत्र २.

$ किं पुनराकृतिः पदार्थ आहोस्विद् द्रव्यम् । उभयमित्याह । कथं ज्ञायते । उभयथा ह्याचार्येण सूत्राणि पठितानि । पा. म. भाष्यम्, आ. १.

instance, the cowness (गोत्व) in a cow (गौ) is the very essence which can never be separated from 'गौ' and which distinguishes गोजाति from other animals All common nouns in language are thus indicative of this common attribute 'genus' (जाति) The second attribute, according to the वैयाकरणs, is a quality (गुण) which distinguishes a thing from others of the same class A quality like 'white' or 'black' can be separated from a class like 'a garment' in which it resides, and all the words showing such a quality are adjectives. The third attribute 'क्रिया' consists of *a series of actions,* which are prior and posterior, and which occupy successive portions of time. For instance, the main action of cooking rice consists of several successive actions, viz, the taking of rice in a winnowing basket, its winnowing, its putting into a pot with water, the placing of the pot on the fireplace, boiling, and lastly *the taking of the pot from the fireplace* All verbs in language denote this क्रिया or a *series of actions.* F Gouin in his '*Art of Teaching and Studying Languages*' *has invented the 'linguistic series'* on the basis of such series of actions He has included several subordinate actions under one main action and prepared his *linguistic series* for the purpose of teaching any language by the Conversational Method Occasional use of such *linguistic series of actions* may also be made while teaching Sanskrit by the Conversational Method Fourthly, संज्ञा or यदृच्छा is an attribute which is impose upon

a person or a thing by the will of the speaker, and which is, therefore, called a proper noun The आलङ्कारिक्‌s, from a practical point of view favour this view of the वैयाकरण्‌s for the purpose of signifying the manifold function of words

↖ *The ancient नैयायिक्‌s assume a different position* as regards the import of words They say that a word does not denote an individual (व्यक्ति) alone, as the faults of आनन्त्य and व्यभिचार occur in that case Again, a word does not signify only the genus (जाति), since it is, for instance, the individual 'गौ' that is related to the primary meaning of a word as well as to the practical activity of 'bringing', 'milking', etc, and since it is absurd to bring the genus 'cowness' (गोत्व) Thus, after rejecting the extreme views of the केवलव्यक्तिवादिन्‌s and the केवलजाति-वादिन्‌s the ancient नैयायिक्‌s strike a golden mean and further say that the word 'गौ' indicates all the three factors, viz., व्यक्ति, जाति and आकृति at the same time In other words, a word *denotes* an individual, *connotes* the genus or class of similar individuals, and distinguishes the individual from other dissimilar individuals by its peculiar *form* or configuration Now the form or configuration of an individual is the arrangement or conjunction of its constituent parts or limbs in a particular way, and this peculiar configuration being the common property of similar individuals leads us to the idea of the genus Thus the word 'गौ' denotes the individual 'गौ', distinguishes the 'गौ' from other animals owing to

her peculiar form 'सास्नादिमत्व' (possession of dewlap, etc.), and connotes the genus 'गोत्व' (cowness) on account of the possession of the common property 'सास्नादिमत्व'. What the नैयायिकs mean is that a word refers to an individual as characterized by its class or genus (जातिविशिष्टव्यक्ति) or to an individual as distinguished by its class and configuration (जात्याकृतिविशिष्टव्यक्ति). The word 'गौः' then denotes the individual 'गौः' as qualified by गोत्वजाति, which is in intimate union with the concrete गोव्यक्ति. If a word thus refers to an individual and its peculiar form or shape, it cannot be said that it signifies the genus alone, as the मीमांसकs assert. For, a class or genus can be apprehended only through the individuals forming it and through their form or shape. It must, therefore, be said that व्यक्ति, आकृति and जाति are the three factors, which are present in the sense of every word, and which taken together give us the full meaning of that word. Although all these factors are present in the sense of a word, yet the motive or interest shown by the speaker in a particular factor or aspect gives more or less prominence to that factor. If we say, 'This is a cow', we give prominence to the individual aspect; if we say 'This cow is possessed of the dewlap, hump, etc.,' we lay stress on her form, and if we say "A cow is called 'a cow' because of her intimate relation to cowness"; we emphasize the class-notion or genus. It may be remarked here that the form or shape of an individual not being

apart from its class, the आकृति may be included in जाति, and that the view of the old नैयायिकs that a word denotes an individual as distinguished by its class or genus (जातिविशिष्टव्यक्ति) may be held as representative.

Against all these views about the import of words the बौद्धs say that a word indicates neither व्यक्ति nor जाति, since व्यक्ति, जाति, etc., being simply the conceptions of our mind imposed upon the so-called external things, are momentary and unreal. They, therefore, uphold the principle of अपोह or अतद्व्यावृत्ति (distinction or exclusion of a thing from what it is not), and say that a word like 'घट' indicates a thing, which possesses peculiarities distinguishing it from all other things like पट, गौः, etc. Thus by saying that 'घट' is not 'पट' they hold that the import of words is of a negative nature.

Now the अद्वैतवेदान्तिन्s hold from the absolute (पारमार्थिक) point of view that the word is an illusory form (विवर्त) of the Absolute ब्रह्मन् and that the distinctions of व्यक्ति and जाति are simply the conceptions of the mind. According to them, therefore, the most expressive word is that which after its own negation seeks to pass beyond all distinctions of व्यक्ति, जाति, etc., and helps one to merge in the all-pervading silence of the Absolute ब्रह्मन्, or which is instrumental in establishing the primal identity of the individual soul with the Universal Soul. Yet, in order to help the individual soul to reach that

express or known.$ For the cognition of the genus the power or significance *as known* is necessary, while for the cognition of an individual it is unnecessary that the power should be known. It is sufficient that the power exists in the individual in a *latent* form. When from the word 'गौः' we have to cognize गोत्वजाति, we are required to know the power residing in गोत्वजाति; but for the cognition of गोव्यक्ति we are not required separately to know the power in गोव्यक्ति, if the same power is latently existent there. For, the word 'गौः' itself can give us the idea of गोव्यक्ति through गोत्वजाति. As soon as the cognition of जाति arises in us after the knowledge of the power in जाति, the same power that latently exists in व्यक्ति can lead us immediately to the cognition of व्यक्ति. In other words, if after hearing a word we have cognized the genus through its express power (ज्ञातशक्ति), we can without delay cognize the individual which is inseparable from the genus, even though we have no knowledge of the power residing in the individual.† For this reason, the individual has no capacity of being directly signified (शक्यत्व, वाच्यत्व), though the power (शक्ति) exists in it. On the other hand, the genus alone has the capacity of direct signification, since it is the genus,

$ यद्वा गवादिपदानां व्यक्तौ शक्तिः स्वरूपसती, न तु ज्ञाता; जातौ तु सा ज्ञाता हेतुः। —वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४.

† जातिशक्तिमत्त्वज्ञाने सति व्यक्तिशक्तिमत्त्वज्ञानं विना व्यक्तिधीनिष्पत्त्य-भावाच्च। —वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४.

and not the individual, that becomes the object of शक्ति *as known*, and only that which is an object of शक्ति as known is capable of *direct signification* (शक्य, वाच्य) § This, in short, means that a word primarily signifies जाति and secondarily व्यक्ति.

Thus there are five conflicting views propounded by the Indian schools of thought regarding the import of words Now in the terminology of Western Logic words are *denotative* according to to the केवलव्यक्तिवादिन्s, *connotative* according to the केवलजातिवादिन्s, both *denotative and connotative* according to the जातिविशिष्टव्यक्तिवादिन्s, and the जात्यादिवादिन्s and *neither denotative nor connotative* according to the अपोहवादिन्s. Every view contains a a grain of truth and none can be wholly rejected, since the function of language is to indicate the individual aspect as well as the class-aspect of a word The problem then rests on what aspect gives us the *direct* signification of words, and it is preferable, on the whole, to say that the aspect of genus or class has the capacity of direct signification. Words in language are by nature never perfectly expressive of the internal meaning, but there are higher and lower degrees of perfect expression in the use of words It may, therefore, be said that the aspect of genus contains a higher degree of perfect expression.

§ ज्ञायमानशक्तिविषयत्वमेव वाच्यत्वमिति जातिरेव वाच्या । अथवा व्यक्तेर्लक्षणयाऽवगम । —वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४.

From the standpoint of *Western psychology* it will be seen that the केवलव्यक्तिवादिन्s stress the *perceptual aspect* of words, the केवलजातिवादिन्s emphasize the *conceptual aspect*, and the जात्यादिवादिन्s and जातिविशिष्टव्यक्तिवादिन्s attend [both to the *perceptual and conceptual aspects*. 'Perception' is concerned with concrete objects or things affecting the five sense-organs; yet the object of perception, which is the result of sensations caused in the mind by an external object, is not the actual object in the external world; it is the 'psychical object', which is supplied by the mind itself in order to help the interpretation of the unity of our sensations, and which is, therefore, more directly present in our consciousness than the external object. This psychical object being a sign or symbol of the outer object is different from the latter. It, therefore, partakes of the aspects of an individual as well as a class or genus, or of the particular as well as the general at the same time. Or, it may be said from another point of view that the psychical object is neither particular nor general, as it is detached both from the external object and the 'Concept'. This double and dubious character of the psychical object accounts for the divergence of views held by the Indian schools of thought about the import of words. This is the reason why the केवलव्यक्तिवादिन्s stress the individual aspect of words, the जात्यादिवादिन्s and the जातिविशिष्टव्यक्तिवादिन्s take into account the aspects of both the individual and the class, and the अपोहवादिन्s deny the existence of व्यक्ति and जाति.

This *psychical object*, which is aroused in the mind itself by our present and past experiences, supplies us, in relation to the external object, with a 'meaning'. Our mind has a natural tendency to find out a *relation* between two or more things mentally presented to it The *relation* thus established *between the psychical object and the actual object* by our present or past experiences contributes to the *meaning*, which arises in the mind itself rather than in the outer object, and which also depends on the relations formerly established in the mind In order to denote this meaning words in language are conventionally used as symbols or signs, and the meaning remains individual, concrete and incomplete until the psychical object has assumed a definite form of the class-aspect, i e., words used to denote merely objects in perception cannot convey their full significance unless they have widened their scope by the help of the *generic aspect in conceptual thinking* This is why there is much truth in the view of the केवलजातिवादिन्s.

When, therefore the class-aspect of words becomes definite in the mind by the transformation of a 'percept' into a 'concept' or a general idea, the *meaning* in our mind assumes a complete form The *concept* is formed in us by the analytico-synthetic process of the *observation* of several individuals, *analysis* of their attributes, *comparison* for finding out their similarities and differences, *abstraction* of similarities from differences, *synthesis* of common properties or attri-

butes, and the use *of names or linguistic symbols* for fixing the unified idea in the mind The unified idea itself contains a full meaning for indicating which verbal symbols or words in language are used as in the case of the perceptual or individual objects The unified idea formed by the analytico-synthetic process is the *concept* pattern or schema of similar individual objects in the world, and it being a developed form of the 'psychical object' enables us to interpret comprehensively several individuals so as to obtain a general meaning The concepts or patterns in our mind being separated from the concrete and particular objects in the perceptual world are of a general and abstract nature They, therefore, give us a comprehensive knowledge of things by including many particular individuals in a general category, and the more such concepts or patterns are stored in our mind, the more we develop our power of understanding the universe Here we understand the propriety of the view of the केवलजातिवादिन्s that the power (शक्ति) of a word is primarily understood in जाति and secondarily in व्यक्ति. Human mind has been, from generation to generation, so accustomed to the above patterns that *the power of conceptual thinking* is, as in the case of the concepts of time and space, inborn in us along with our power of the perception of individual objects

It may, however, be said that our thinking is never purely perceptual, but it is both perceptual and conceptual from our childhood Although the

psychical object in us partakes of a tinge of abstraction on account of its isolation from the actual object, yet the concrete and individual aspect seems to be prominent in it It is, therefore, true that our thinking in childhood is more perceptual than conceptual, though we find from the behaviour and speech of children that generic images, which are based more on similarities than on difference of objects, are gradually being formed in them, leading them slowly to the conceptual level Though children use words to express generic images of things, yet they are not fully conscious of the class-aspect of those words, as they learn their use mostly by the imitation of elders (वृद्धव्यवहार) The use of words by children is, therefore, denotative rather than connotative and here we realize the importance of the theories of जात्यादिवादिन्s and जातिविशिष्टव्यक्तिवादिन्s The process of perceptual and conceptual thinking thus goes on alternately throughout the whole life, and we have correspondingly to attend to the individual as well as the generic aspect of words in the use of language Thus *words*, which are, as indicated above, the external *linguistic signs or symbols* of inner ideas, perceptual or conceptual, help us to recall them in our minds and carry on our daily affairs by means of the *communication* of those ideas Language, therefore, not only aids, records and preserves our thought, but assists us in our *communication*, which may be known to be its chief function, particularly in language teaching

The teaching of a new language to children should accordingly be based on both the aspects mentioned above, though the individual and concrete aspect of words depending on perceptual thinking would occupy a prominent position in their case. Language-teaching in childhood will thus be fruitful, if we shall gradually start from the perceptual to the conceptual level. In other words, gestures, pictures, diagrams, etc., will be used in association with spoken words. Here the common truth contained in the views of जात्यादिवादिन्s and जातिविशिष्टव्यक्तिवादिन्s will be amalgamated in the interest of young pupils, after taking into account the aspects of जाति (genus), व्यक्ति (individual), and आकृति (concrete form of objects.)

An important point must be noted here that although the मीमांसकs in general recognize the theory of class-connotation of words (केवलजातिवाद), yet the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s among them, who hold that a sentence is the unit of language, recommend the usage of elders (वृद्धव्यवहार) and the learning of individual words through the context of a sentence as a superior way of learning language. In the usage of elders and in the imitation of it by children the perceptual (individual) aspect of words seems to be more prominent than the conceptual (generic) aspect, which is the mainstay of the theory of केवलजातिवाद. How is this contradiction in the views of the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s to be removed ? The answer is that the conceptual aspect of words is not

altogether absent in the minds of children and that it is gradually developed in them through the mental process of *inclusion and exclusion* or the *analytico-synthetic* process (अन्वय-व्यतिरेक) as formerly treated of The pupils, therefore, by the time they begin to learn a new language like Sanskrit, have already their power of conceptual thinking more developed than that in childhood. Particularly, in the use of their mother tongue, at this stage, they are accustomed to be more conscious of the class-aspect of words than the individual one In other words, they can, by the use of 'common nouns' in the mother tongue, understand individual objects or persons (व्यक्ति) secondarily through class-notions (जाति) Inasmuch as these class-notions exist in the minds of pupils at this stage and lead them still further to understand other class-notions, the theory of केवलजातिवाद is correct. This theory can, therefore, be reconciled with the 'usage of elders' particularly at the stage of learning a new language like Sanskrit. It will then be found that while teaching individual words, at this stage, in the context of a connected sentence and in association with concrete things, the class-notion of those words *is not to be newly formed by the teacher. The* class-notion, being already existent in the minds of *pupils, is simply to be awakened through concrete* objects, pictures, etc , so as to establish *a direct bond between a new word and an idea (concept).* The pupils, while learning new words in association with concrete objects, do not also take particular

words to mean only the objects shown by the teacher, but understand them in the light of their class-notions of those objects The class-aspect of words here *primarily* arises in their minds and the individual aspect *secondarily* In other words, the same cognition of pupils that cognizes the genus (जाति) also cognizes the individual (व्यक्ति) When the words in an unknown language are being newly introduced in association with objects, it is the class-aspect of words present in the minds of pupils that instantly suggests the corresponding words *in the mother tongue to them* as a result of mental translation, and those known words are sometimes impatiently given out by them The theory of केवल जातिवाद in alliance with वृद्धव्यवहार is thus found to be consistent particularly at the pupil s stage of learning a language other than the mother tongue

One would ask here why words in the mother tongue should not be brought into relation with new words in an unknown language by the process of 'translation', when the pupils have thus reached the conceptual level The answer is that the *process of translation* is purely conceptual and results in the tedium and disgust of young pupils in whose case the *perceptual aspect of teaching* is beneficial Translation may, of course be resorted to in the case of abstract words, as the next direct way of introducing them But we must not forget that words in any language are dead things unless they are made alive by the concrete devices of gestures, intonation, objects, context, etc, in *oral*

teaching Again, it is an obvious fact that while forming new concepts or learning an unknown subject the tendency of all human beings, young and old is generally to think in terms of *concrete* things which symbolize those concepts and facilitate clear understanding It need not be told how the use of concrete illustrations and symbolism makes an abstract and abstruse subject intelligible. Hence, while teaching a new language, concrete things like models, pictures diagrams, etc, are calculated to serve the purpose of fixing, even in the minds of advanced students the concepts already formed by them through their mother tongue, and they awaken the 'apperception masses' of pupils after bringing out the *relation* between 'a psychical object' and 'an actual object,' or between a concept and a concrete thing In other words, they revive their memory and help the *direct communication* of the *meaning* of a word As the relation (वृत्ति) between a new word and its meaning (पद and पदार्थ) is here *directly* established by immediately showing an object closely related to the meaning and by making the pupils briskly repeat that word in chorus and individually, very little chance is left for its mental translation by the pupils, and the new word being coloured and made alive by concrete life-situations can be well learnt and recollected owing to the association of ideas This principle of the modern Direct or Conversational Method may, therefore, be advantageously followed at the elementary

and intermediate stages of teaching Sanskrit, since it, without being antagonistic, can be well reconciled with the above linguistic principles formulated by the Indian schools of thought, more particularly with the 'usage of elders' (वृद्धव्यवहार) sanctioned by the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s. Just as the आलङ्कारिकs have in general tried to harmonize the views of the above Indian schools and specially followed the वात्यादि-वादिन्s (वैयाकरणs) for the practical purpose of explaining the poetic function of words, we too have here tried to harmonize the Oriental and Western views for the purpose of their practical application to the teaching of Sanskrit words.

After discussing the problem as to *where the expressive power* (शक्ति) *of a word resides* and after dealing with *its practical implications*, we shall turn to the four kinds of वृत्ति viz., योग, रूढि, योगरूढि and यौगिकरूढि, corresponding to which words are divided into four classes, viz., यौगिक, रूढ, योगरूढ and यौगिकरूढ, according to the different modes through which they yield their meanings. 'योग' means etymology, derivation or *the significance of the component parts of a word* (अवयवशक्ति). Here, of course, the meaning of a word is understood from its component parts, which are either a root or a noun and a prefix or a suffix. The यौगिक word does not signify anything more or less than the meanings of its parts, but yields, on the whole, only that meaning which is implied in the parts. For instance, the meaning of the word 'पाचक' is understood by

us as 'पाककर्ता' (a cook) from the root 'पच्' (to cook) and the कर्तरि suffix 'अक'. Secondly, 'रूढि' means the popular, conventional or customary significance of a word. In the case of a रूढ word the meaning is determined by *the power of the whole word* (समुदाय शक्ति) without reference to the meanings of its parts. For instance, the word 'मण्डप' etymologically means 'one who protects scum' (मण्ड + प = मण्ड पातीति), but this meaning rarely occurs to us, since we conventionally understand the collective meaning of the whole word 'मण्डप' as 'an open hall'. The नैरुक्तs (etymologists) and the वैयाकरणs propound a theory that all nouns in language are derived from roots ('आख्यातजानि नामानि'–निरुक्त) But this is an extreme case, as the conventional meanings of रूढ words *are seen to have acquired more significance* than their root-meanings, which can rarely be traced in the former Thirdly, a 'योगरूढ' or derivatively conventional word is that which yields its meaning through derivation or etymology (योग) as well as convention (रूढि) Here both the derivative meaning and the conventional meaning coincide with each other, as both of them *refer to the same object* In other words, the meaning obtained from the component parts of a word is the same as that obtained collectively from the whole word For example, the etymological meaning of the word 'पङ्कज', when it is derived from its component parts, is 'what grows in the mud' (पङ्क + ज = पङ्काज्जायते

इति). This meaning is joined through contiguity to the conventional or collective meaning of the whole word 'पङ्कज' which signifies 'a lotus'. Both these meanings referring to the same object agree with each other. It must be noted here that the conventional meaning is more proximate to the mind than the etymological one, as the former occurs to us instantly; while the etymological meaning occuring late to the mind is distant from us, as it is necessary for us to possess the knowledge of प्रकृति (crude form) and प्रत्यय (affix) before we undersand the root-meaning. Many Sanskrit words belong to this 'योगरूढ' type, since both the etymological and conventional meanings can be traced in them. There is, however, a linguistic rule in Sanskrit that convention or usage is more powerful than etymology (योगाद्रूढिर्बलीयसी). Lastly, a 'यौगिकरूढ' or derivative-and-conventional word is that, the meaning of which is ascertained either etymologically by the powers of its component parts or conventionally by the power of the whole. In this case both the meanings being determined independently of each other, both of them are understood separately. The word 'उद्भिद्', for example, etymologically means 'what shoots up or a tree' (उद् + भिद् = ऊर्ध्वं भिनत्तीति), while conventionally 'उद्भिद्' is a kind of sacrifice. Here the two independent meanings are understood from the same word, yet they *refer to separate objects.*

An important point to be noted is that 'रूढ' words always prevail over 'यौगिक' words as regards

the determination of meaning The मीमांसक too while discussing the relative importance of the six modes of evidence (प्रमाण) in the treatment of 'injunctions of application' (विनियोगविधि) lay down a very sound principle of interpretation that 'लिङ्ग' or the word-meaning established by usage (रूढि) is a stronger mode of evidence than 'समाख्या' or name, the meaning in which is determined by योग (etymology) Thus in the matter of interpretation they attach more importance to the conventional meanings (रूढार्थ) of words than to the etymological ones (यौगिकार्थ) They further say that etymology is to be resorted to only when other more important means of interpretation are unavailable This important linguistic principle is as much useful in language-teaching as it is in the interpretation of advanced Shastric works Sanskrit teachers, who have up to this time been so fond of laying undue stress on the teaching of verbs so as to enable their pupils to derive Sanskrit words from their root-stems, will it is hoped, note this principle and will kindly abstain from the predominantly etymological teaching of Sanskrit language and literature They will bear in mind the fact that etymology is purely an analytical and tedious process of dissolving a unified word into a crude form (प्रकृति) and an affix (प्रत्यय) If this process is resorted to, particularly at the elementary and intermediate stages of Sanskrit teaching, pupils are left in the dark about the beauty of ideas and expression in Sanskrit

literature, and are bound to be scared away from the subject. To engage oneself simply in the etymological study of words bereft of their context of a sentence is a futile attempt. This does not, of course, mean that while teaching Sanskrit literature to advanced students, the etymology of a word or two should not be given here and there, if without marring the beauty of a passage it adds to the *purport* (synthetic meaning) of a sentence or a paragraph. Yet it is advisable for the sake of literary appreciation and interest of pupils to accept the conventional meanings of words as they are current in Sanskrit literature, and teach them in their proper context. The Sanskrit words, therefore, that are to be introduced according to 'वृद्धव्यवहार' at the beginner's stage, should all of them be concrete rather than abstract, and of conventional meanings (रूढार्थ) rather than of etymological ones (यौगिकार्थ).

XIV. PURPORT (तात्पर्य)

Thus the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, with whom even the नैयायिकs should be classed, after dealing with the detached meanings of words existing independently in language say that when a *relation* is established between the senses of such words in a sentence by means of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and सन्निधि, a new meaning, which is not the meaning of indivi-

dual words but which is that of the sentence as a whole, arises in the form of तात्पर्यार्थ. It will then be found that unlike the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s they *start from words to a sentence rather than from a sentence to words* It has already been observed that the views of the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s are useful at the initial stage of Sanskrit teaching, that those of the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s must be taken *into account particularly at the* advanced stage, and that the combination (समुच्चय) of both of them would thus be fruitful in Sanskrit teaching as a whole It is with this end in view that *the principles of the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s about the power* (शक्ति) of detached words in language have been detailed in the preceding section While dealing with the दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय we have already explained the significance of the three principles of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and सन्निधि as formulated by the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s. It will now be advisable to turn to the तात्पर्यवृत्ति of that school after noting the special features of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and सन्निधि, which *establish relations between the senses of independent* words and lead us to तात्पर्य,–the meaning of the whole sentence According to the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s then a sentence is a group of words* possessing आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and सन्निधि

Now the special feature of आकाङ्क्षा is that it does not merely lie in the juxtaposition of words, as in

* वाक्यं पदसमूहः —तर्कसङ्ग्रह ।

the expression 'घटः कर्मत्वमानयनं कृतिः' (pot-objecthood; bringing-action) in which words are not mutually expectant (साकाङ्क्ष). आकाङ्क्षा can be found between the crude form (प्रकृति) of a word and the affix (प्रत्यय) applied to it. For example, in the sentence 'घटमानय' (Bring a pot) the apprehension (ज्ञान) of the objective case-affix 'अम्' after the word 'घट' shows its expectancy with the words 'घट' and 'आनय' and becomes the cause of the verbal comprehension (शाब्दबोध) that 'घट' is the object of the verb 'आनय'.

Secondly, योग्यता means consistency or proper connection (अन्वय, सम्बन्ध) of the meaning of a word with that of another word. This proper connection depends upon the non-contradiction of our empiric experience. For instance, in the sentence 'घटमानय' the meanings of the words 'घटम्', and 'आनय' have between them a proper connection or consistency which does not contradict our experience. The sentence, therefore, leads us to verbal comprehension. On the other hand, in the sentence 'आकाशमानय' (Bring the sky) the meanings of the words 'आकाशम्' and 'आनय' have between them an improper connection which contradicts our experience. The latter sentence, therefore, does not yield a consistent meaning.

Thirdly, सन्निधि or आसत्ति (contiguity, proximity) is usually defined as the juxtaposition of consecutive words without an interval. If words are

separated from one another by the intervention of other words, the connection (अन्वय) of their meanings cannot be understood For instance, if we say ' गिरिर्भुक्तमग्निमान् देवदत्तेन ' (the mountain, has eaten, fiery, Devadatta), the expression does not lead to verbal comprehension, since suitable words are not placed in juxtaposition, while the sentences ' गिरिरग्निमान्, भुक्त देवदत्तेन ' (The mountain is fiery, देवदत्त has eaten) yield meanings on account of juxtaposition The नव्यनैयायिकs, however, reject this kind of आसत्ति and *psychologically* define it as an *immediate recollection* (उपस्थिति, स्मृति) of the meanings of words through their 'वृत्ति' (relation of words to meanings) They say that even when words in a verse are separated by the intervention of other words, we can have verbal comprehension Hence contiguity or proximity in the form of *uninterrupted recollection* of meanings related to words *through the* वृत्तिs called शक्ति *(expression) or* लक्षणा (implication) is the cause of verbal comprehension, and not the first kind of contiguity. It does not matter whether words in a sentence are proximate *or not proximate to one another, but the recollection* of word-meanings mutually related must be immediate This does not imply that any meaning of any word in any form is recollected The suitability of words depends, of course, upon the non-contradiction of our experience Such आसत्ति itself is the cause of verbal comprehension and not the knowledge of आसत्ति.

In connection with this आसत्ति the नैयायिक psychologically explain how the comprehension of a sentence takes place through individual words. In this respect they say that while reading a book or hearing a speech, the perception of the first word in a sentence leaves *an impression* on our mind and then that of the second, third, etc. Though such perceptions are transitory, the impressions left by them last for a long time and awaken our *memory* Thus through the impressions of consecutive words left on the mind there arises in us a *collective recollection* of all words This recollection is of the nature of *collective cognition* (समूहालम्बनात्मक ज्ञान) and is itself the knowledge of आसत्ति. Like a single perception arising from the contact of our sense-organs with a collection of objects, as a picture, a book, a table, a clock, etc.' a single recollection can arise in us from several impressions of words The stimulus of the collective recollection (समूहालम्बनात्मक स्मृति) is the perception of the last letter of the last word, accompanied by the impressions of preceding words Just as the collective recollection of a single word 'देवदत्त' occurs to us by the perception of the last letter 'त', aided by the consecutive impressions of the preceding letters, similarly the recollection of the last letter of the last word in a sentence, aided by the consecutive impressions of the preceding words in it, arises in us. As this collective recollection of words, otherwise called आसत्ति, does take place in the mind, it

becomes the cause of creating *a synthetic comprehension* of words, sentences, paragraphs, etc.

The प्राचीननैयायिक्स, however, describe the genesis *of this recollection in a somewhat different way*. As all knowledge, they say, is a transient phenomenon, the *recollection of every preceding word* also is transient Hence several recollections of *several words* would *not stand together* simultaneously, (and thus verbal comprehension would be impossible For this reason it must be said that the *recollection*, which is related to the meanings of words and which is the cause of verbal comprehension, itself being of the nature of *collective cognition*, is *one* and not manifold This collective recollection alone leads to the *simultaneous* verbal comprehension of the meanings of *all* words connected as क्रिया (action), कर्म (object), करण (instrument), etc, according to the maxim of 'pigeons on a threshing-floor' (खलेकपोतन्याय). *Relating to this maxim there is a verse which* means as follows "Just as pigeons old, full-grown and young *simultaneously come down to a threshing-floor* for picking grains, similarly in a sentence (e g घटमानय) the meanings of words (e g घटम् and आनय) being mutually connected together as क्रिया, कर्म, *etc*, *become the object of simultaneous* verbal comprehension " †

---

† वृद्धा युवान शिशव कपोता खले यथामी युगपत्पतन्ति ।
तथैव सर्वे युगपत्पदार्था परस्परेणान्वयिनो भवन्ति ॥
Quoted in the सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि under verse 83.

Some नैयायिकs who do not recognize the above simultaneous recollection (समूहालम्बनात्मक स्मृति) say: " That meaning of a word, which is expectant of, and consistent with, the meaning of another contiguous word, can be understood from words themselves, after it is connected with another meaning. "S That is to say, the meaning of a word having a connection with another meaning is first understood from words. Similarly, the meaning of the parts of a sentence (खण्डवाक्य) arising from the connection of several meanings can first be obtained from words, and the comprehension of the meanings of parts (खण्डवाक्य) then leads to the comprehension of the meaning of the whole sentence (महावाक्य). Even though we suppose that the comprehension of the meaning of former parts vanishes on account of the transitoriness of knowledge, yet the recollection of the meaning of those parts or subordinate clauses (अवान्तरवाक्य) lasts in our mind. This recollection, therefore, leads us to the verbal comprehension of the whole sentence. For instance, in the sentence 'घटमानय' we first understand from the word 'घटम्' the meaning of the part that 'घट' (jar) is the object (कर्म) of some action, or is connected with some action. This meaning of the word 'घटम्' being connected with the meaning of 'bringing' obtained from the

S यद्यदाकाङ्क्षितं योग्यं सन्निधानं प्रपद्यते ।
तेन तेनान्वितः स्वार्थः पदैरेवावगम्यते ॥
Quoted in the सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि under verse 83.

word 'आनय' yields the meaning of the whole sentence. The नैयायिकs, therefore, are not required to postulate the superfluous स्फोट which, according to the वैयाकरणs, is said to contain the whole unified meaning of an author or speaker, and is also said to be revealed by the letters, words, sentences, paragraphs, nay, the whole book he writes. शङ्कराचार्य here tells us, as we have already seen, that the synthetic activity of the mind (समस्तप्रत्ययमर्शिनी बुद्धि) is able to give us a unified meaning from letters, words, sentences, paragraphs, etc. (सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि).

Now what should be supplied (अध्याहृत) when a sentence is incomplete in consequence of something being unexpressed? Are we to supply an actual word or simply its meaning? That is to say, if, for instance, in the incomplete sentence 'द्वारम्—' (—door) the verb is unexpressed, should we supply the actual word 'पिधेहि' (shut) or would it do if simply the general meaning of 'shutting' occurs to the mind without our being required to supply a particular word in the sentence? Here the प्राभाकरमीमांसक say that it is better to supply simply the meaning than the word, since we are more concerned with the meaning than with the word used to indicate it; and unless the meaning of 'shutting' first occurs to us from the incomplete sentence 'द्वारम्—', we cannot supply the word 'पिधेहि'. The meaning which first occurs to us in such cases should, therefore, be supplied rather than the actual word. It is not necessary that the

recollection of meaning should arise only through a word, for, it can also arise without the use of a word It is, therefore, preferable to supply in an incomplete sentence 'meaning' (अर्थाध्याहार) rather than a 'word' (पदाध्याहार) The नैयायिक्स and वेदान्तिन्स* say against this that in such cases *a word* must be supplied and not simply its meaning, if we want to have verbal comprehension. Meaning, without the actual use of a word, can be conveyed by perception (प्रत्यक्षप्रमाण) also If, for example, a jar (घट) is placed in front of us, we can show it merely by means of gesture (i e with the finger) and say 'एन—पश्य' (See this—) without using the word 'घटम्'. Here, the meaning of the object 'घट' is understood, though the actual word 'घट' for it is not used But it must be remembered that this meaning of the jar is understood through *perception* and not through verbal comprehension (शाब्दबोध), which requires us to understand the connection (अन्वय) of *words* in a sentence It is, therefore, necessary to supply the actual words 'पिधेहि' and 'घटम्' in the incomplete sentences 'द्वारम् —' and 'एन—पश्य' respectively, so as to show the connection of words and have verbal comprehension For, verbal comprehension is possible only if the cognition of mean-

---

* मानान्तरोपस्थापितपदार्थस्यान्वयबोधाभावात् 'पदजन्या' इति। अत एवाश्रुतस्थले तत्तत्पदाध्याहार. । 'द्वारम्' इत्यादौ 'पिधेहि' इति ॥

—वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४, सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि, श्लोक ८३.

ing takes place through particular *words,* which must be supplied to complete the sense of a sentence When a word is thus supplied, the *perception of it* conveys to us *its meaning* by means of वृत्ति (relation of a word to its meaning), and the apprehension of this meaning further leads us to the verbal comprehension of the whole sentence Again, in every sentence the verb and words with particular case-affixes (कारकपदानि) are expectant (साकाङ्क्ष) of one another Unless, therefore, the actual verb 'पिधेहि' is supplied (पदाध्याहार), the कारकपद ' द्वारम् ' would not yield its complete meaning There are other examples where a word alone must be supplied (पदाध्याहार) and not its meaning If we simply say 'पुष्पेभ्य —' (—for flowers), the actual word 'स्पृहयति' (craves) must be supplied, as the peculiar use of the dative case in the word 'पुष्पभ्य ' requires us, according to a grammatical rule, to supply the verb 'स्पृहयति' alone and not merely the meaning of 'craving', which may be expressed in any other way. This principle of पदाध्याहार (supplying a word) is very important in language-teaching When a language is being taught newly, mere gestures, intonation, etc, used by the teacher will sometimes convey meanings to the students It must, however, be noted that though the meaning can be conveyed by gestures, etc, without the use of words, yet in language-teaching actual words introduced to pupils are more important than other means of

conveying the meaning. It will, therefore, be advisable to make a clear statement of *actual words* in sentences, though gestures, etc., will be used in direct association with those words for amplifying their meanings. In the matter of construing and understanding literature at the advanced stage too it is necessary to supply actual *words* in incomplete sentences rather than their meanings only. (सिद्धान्तमुक्तावली, तर्कदीपिका).

It has been observed above that the recollection of the meanings of parts or subordinate clauses (अवान्तरवाक्य) leads us to the verbal comprehension of a large sentence or paragraph (महावाक्य) as a whole. In other words, a large sentence or paragraph is a collection of subordinate clauses,† which are mutually connected together by means of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and आसत्ति. When, after knowing the mutual connection of different subordinate clauses, a special unified sense (तात्पर्य) is exhibited, we get syntactical unity (एकवाक्यता). This syntactical unity is based on a two-fold relation: (1) that of a word to a sentence of which it forms part (पदैकवाक्यता), and (2) that of a sentence to another sentence (वाक्यैकवाक्यता). (1) As regards पदैकवाक्यता the मीमांसक think that अर्थवाद (corroborative or eulogistic sentences) never directly signify a command (विधि) or prohibition (निषेध); but that they indicate their meanings by means of an

† वाक्योच्चयो महावाक्यम्। (साहित्यदर्पण:, २।१)

explanatory repetition (अनुवाद) or a subordinate statement. The sentences comprising अर्थवादs cannot, therefore, yield the principal meaning, but merely praise or censure an injunction (विधि), which indicates the principal meaning. The अर्थवादs are not, however, meaningless, since they are syntactically connected with an injunction or the principal sentence. Thus the collection of words contained in an अर्थवाद conveys the meaning of 'praise' which is required by an injunction, occupies the position of a single word, and forms syntactical unity with the sentence containing that injunction. Hence अर्थवाद serving as a single word forms a syntactical* whole with an injunction (विधि). In other words, the relation of an अर्थवाद to an injunction is respectively that *of a word to a sentence* of which it *forms part. This is called* पदैकवाक्यता *by the* मीमांसकs.

(2) Now syntactical unity manifested in the relation of *a sentence*† *to another sentence* (वाक्यैकवाक्यता) can be found where two (or more) sentences, each of which indicates distinctly a

---

* विध्यपेक्षितप्राशस्त्यरूपपदार्थप्रत्यायकतयाऽर्थवादपदसमुदायस्य पदस्थानीयतया विधिवाक्येनैकवाक्यत्वं भवतीत्यर्थवादवाक्याना पदैकवाक्यता।

—वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४.

† क तर्हि वाक्यैकवाक्यता? यत्र प्रत्येकं भिन्नभिन्नसंसर्गप्रतिपादकयोर्वाक्ययोराकाङ्क्षावशेन महावाक्यार्थबोधकत्वम्। ... वाक्यानां परस्परापेक्षिताङ्गाङ्गिभावबोधकतया एकवाक्यता। तदुक्त भट्टपादैः—'स्वार्थबोधे समाप्तानामङ्गाङ्गित्वाद्यपेक्षया। वाक्यानामेकवाक्यत्व पुनः संहत्य जायते॥' इति।

—वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४.

different relation of words and their meanings, yield the meaning of a larger sentence or paragraph on account of their mutual expectancy. Here, the meaning of one sentence being connected with that of another, the two (or more) sentences together express one meaning in the form of *purport* (तात्पर्य). Thus sentences showing the mutually expected relation of principal and subordinate, are found to possess syntactical unity. Here, कुमारिलभट्ट says–" When sentences, which are complete in respect of their own meanings, again combine because of their relation of principal and subordinate, they form syntactical unity. "This syntactical unity in respect of sentences (वाक्यैकवाक्यता) is itself the meaning of a major sentence or a passage in the form of *purport* (तात्पर्य). Before we understand the meaning of such a longer sentence or a passage (महावाक्य), it is necessary for us to understand the meanings of subordinate clauses (अवान्तरवाक्यार्थ).

The above syntactical unity lies especially in the intended meaning or purport (तात्पर्य) of a speaker or writer according to the नैयायिकs. They, therefore, hold that the unified meaning of a sentence depends upon the *intention*$ of the speaker or writer and that a definite knowledge of this intention is as much the cause of verbal comprehension as that of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and आसत्ति. Whether

---

$ (a) वक्तुरिच्छा तु तात्पर्यम् । —भाषापरिच्छेदः ८४

(b) तत्प्रतीतीच्छयोच्चरितत्वं तात्पर्यम् । —तर्कदीपिका

the meaning of a word should be construed with the meaning of a particular word alone depends more on the intention of the speaker or writer than on आकाङ्क्षा. For instance, in the sentence 'अयमेति पुत्रो राज्ञः पुरुषोऽपसार्यताम्' there is expectancy (आकाङ्क्षा) between the words 'पुत्रः' and 'राज्ञः' as well as 'राज्ञः' and 'पुरुषः'; and the sentence *being thus ambiguous would either mean*, 'Here comes the son of the King, the man should be removed', or 'Here comes the son (my son), the man (officer) of the King should be removed' In this case a doubt arises whether the word 'राज्ञः' is to be construed with 'पुत्रः' or 'पुरुषः', and it can be removed by knowing the intended meaning (तात्पर्य) of the speaker or writer that the word 'राज्ञः' is to be construed with 'पुत्रः' and not with 'पुरुषः'. Knowledge of तात्पर्य (purport, drift) *is*, therefore, the fourth condition necessary for verbal comprehension in addition to आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and आसत्ति. *Again, a word in a sentence has sometimes* more than one meaning Whether it means this or that in a particular context depends also upon the intention of the speaker or writer. For example, the sentence 'सैन्धवमानय' can either mean 'Bring *salt*' or 'Bring a *horse*', as the word 'सैन्धव' has two meanings, viz, 'salt' or 'a horse'. Which of these two meanings is to be accepted in a particular context *is determined by the hearer after knowing* the intention of the speaker. If the speaker is dining, the word 'सैन्धव' would mean 'salt' and if

he is going out, it would mean 'a horse'. For, at the time of dining the speaker's intention cannot be that a *horse* should be brought; while at the time of going out he cannot intend that *salt* should be brought. The particular occassion or context (प्रकरण), therefore, demands that we should understand only a particular meaning which can be determined by knowing the intention or purport of the speaker. If we suppose that the apprehension of purport is not a cause of verbal comprehension, the word 'सैन्धव' would not sometimes mean 'salt' and sometimes 'a horse'. For this reason it must be admitted that there is a causal relation between the knowledge of intention or purport and verbal comprehension.

नागेश$ thinks that the apprehension of तात्पर्य is essential only in the case of equivocal words, and that the mere context, etc., can determine तात्पर्य. Others also say that purpose (अर्थ), context (प्रकरण), a special characteristic (लिङ्ग), propriety (औचित्य), place (देश), and time (काल) are the determinants of the meanings of words, † and since they always precede verbal comprehension, they, rather than the knowledge

---

$ नानार्थस्थले लोके तात्पर्यं तु एतत्पद वाक्य वा एतदर्थप्रत्ययाय मयोच्चार्यत इति प्रयोक्तुरिच्छारूपम् । तात्पर्यनियामक च लोके प्रकरणादिकमेव । —परमलघुमञ्जूषा.

† अर्थात्प्रकरणाल्लिङ्गादौचित्याद्देशकालतः ।
शब्दार्थास्तु विभिद्यन्ते न रूपादेव केवलात् ॥

of तात्पर्य, should be held to be the causes of verbal comprehension The नैयायिक्स, however, think that if 'context' etc, are taken to be the causes, it is clear that all those causes precede every verbal comprehension But since those causes are manifold, it cannot be decided what particular cause precedes what particular verbal comprehension. Instead of grouping together all those manifold causes as showing the purport or intention, it is better according to the law of parsimony (लाघव), to accept the knowledge of purport itself as a single cause of verbal comprehension According to the नैयायिक्स God is the author or speaker of the Vedas and the apprehension of his intention is the cause of verbal comprehension, while in the case of words mechanically repeated by a parrot they take the intention of God or a human trainer to to be the cause

The वेदान्तिन्स along with the मीमांसक्स accept तात्पर्य as the cause of verbal comprehension If they would not accept तात्पर्य, all their attempts for the ascertainment of the purport of Vedic sentences would be futile They, however, say that the definitions of तात्पर्य formulated by the नैयायिक्स, as, 'the intention of the speaker' (वक्तुरिच्छा) or 'the utterance of words with a desire to convey a meaning' (त प्रतीतीच्छयोच्चरितत्वम्) are not correct For, it is not always true that there is an intention or desire of the speaker to convey a meaning For instance, there can be no intention or desire of

communication in the words mechanically uttered by a parrot or an idiot; yet those words are understood by us. Secondly, a Vedic priest repeating Vedic texts without knowing their meaning cannot be said to have an intention or desire to convey a meaning; yet the words uttered by him can be understood by one who knows their meaning. Thirdly, when a teacher is found to give a wrong explanation of a text, the student realizes that the teacher does not understand what he says. It cannot be here said that the teacher has a definite intention or purport, since what he supplies as an explanation differs from actual experience and the meaning of the text. We cannot even say that in the Vedic texts uttered unintentionally by a Vedic priest there is the intention or purport of God who is supposed to be the author of the Vedas. For, schools like those of the नास्तिक्s and the मीमांसक्s deny the existence of God and his authorship of the Vedas; yet they are found to interpret the meaning of the Vedas. Thus declaring the नैयायिक्s' definition of तात्पर्य to be wrong the वेदान्तिन्s say that तात्पर्य (purport) is ' the capacity of words in a sentence to express a particular meaning.' † That is to say, words themselves have the inherent capacity (शक्ति) to produce a particular cognition of the correlation (संसर्ग, अन्वय) of their meanings. If the sentence 'गेहे घटः' (A pot in the house) is uttered without understanding its meaning, the sentence

† तत्प्रतीतिजननयोग्यत्वं तात्पर्यम् । —वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४.

itself has the inherent capacity for producing the cognition of the *relation* of 'घट' (a pot)—and not that of 'पट' (a garment)—to 'गेह' (the house) The listener is able to understand this particular meaning in spite of its comprehension or non-comprehension by the speaker. Hence the capacity of the sentence to convey the particular relation between 'घट' and 'गेह' is called तात्पर्य (purport), and the apprehension of this तात्पर्य leads us to verbal comprehension This capacity or power (शक्ति) of a sentence is known when it is not impossible for us to show the mutual relation of words in that sentence As in the sentence 'गेहे घट' there is no impossibility of establishing the relation (अन्वयानुपपत्ति) between 'गेह' and 'घट', the capacity of that sentence to show the particular relation of 'location and the thing fit to be located' (आधाराधेयभावसम्बन्ध) is purport itself Thus according to the वेदान्तिन्s the impossibility of establishing a relation (अन्वयानुपपत्ति), non-accomplishment of purpose (प्रयोजनासिद्धि) and context, etc (प्रकरणादिक) help us indirectly in determining the purport of sentences If, then, the existence, in a sentence, of words *fit to convey a particular sense* can be defined as 'purport', a non-Vedic (लौकिक) or a Vedic sentence, though unintelligible to the speaker, has inherent capacity to convey a meaning according to this flawless definition

Here the नैयायिकs after quoting the sentence 'सैन्धवमानय' raise an objection that although the word

'सैन्धव' has capacity to signify (तत्प्रतीतिजननयोग्यत्वम्) two meanings, yet the speaker's *desire* (वक्तुरिच्छा) to convey a specific meaning ('salt' or 'a horse') in a specific context must be taken into account.

The वेदान्तिन्s answer this objection by adding a qualification, viz, 'तदन्यप्रतीतीच्छयाऽनुच्चरितत्वम्' to their above definition of तात्पर्य, and give the whole definition as 'तत्प्रतीतिजननयोग्यत्वे सति तदन्यप्रतीतीच्छयाऽनुच्चरितत्वम्'. Purport then means "the capacity of words to convey a particular meaning in the absence of their utterance with the desire or intention of conveying any other meaning" In this way, though the word 'सैन्धव' has capacity to signify *two* meanings, viz, 'salt' and 'a horse', yet if a person utters that word while dining, his servant, after understanding the purport of the sentence from this particular context, will take the word 'सैन्धव' to mean 'salt' alone and not 'a horse', because the word 'सैन्धव' having capacity to mean 'salt' is not uttered with the intention of conveying the other meaning, viz., 'a horse'. Again, the word 'सैन्धव' cannot *simultaneously* suggest the two meanings. For, when the purport of the sentence 'सैन्धवमानय' is understood, the meaning that first occurs to the servant is 'salt' and then 'a horse' in due order Although we suppose that the two meanings of an equivocal word—as in the case of सैन्धव—are meant to be simultaneously perceived in a literary passage, the above definition is not inapplicable, since the

word 'तत्' in the definition can include two meanings also This definition of 'तात्पर्य' is thus equally applicable to non-Vedic as well as Vedic sentences unintelligently uttered either by a parrot or a priest without any desire or intention of communication

According to the मीमांसक्s and वेदान्तिन्s शक्ति or the inherent power residing in all things is a distinct category Just as there is inherent power in the fire to burn anything, so in words also, say the मीमांसक्s and वेदान्तिन्s, there is inherent power, which being distinct from words and objects denoted by them is the determining characteristic (अवच्छेदक) of their capacity to express a particular meaning Such words in a sentence having inherent power in them to show the *mutual relation* of their meanings naturally express Purport Thus purport, which consists in the inherent power of words or sentences to produce a *synthetic* cognition independently of the intention of the speaker (वक्तुरिच्छा), is a cause of verbal comprehension according to the वेदान्तिन्s The वेदान्तिन्s and the मीमांसक्s, therefore, accept तात्पर्यवृत्ति in this particular sense and often utilize this important linguistic principle in determining the unified sense of the Vedic texts They always determine the *purport or synthetic* meaning of the Vedas by employing the six मीमांसा rules of interpretation, viz (i) Unity of the beginning and conclusion of a work (उपक्रमोपसंहार), (ii) Repetition of the main topic in various

contexts (अभ्यास), (iii) Novelty of the subject-matter (अपूर्वता), (iv) Fruit or result (फल), (v) Praise or incidental remarks as distinguished from the main theme (अर्थवाद), and (vi) Arguments in favour of the main topic (उपपत्ति). The मीमांसक्s employ these rules for determining the purport of the कर्मकाण्ड of the Vedas, while the वेदान्तिन्s (शङ्कराचार्य) use them for establishing the unified meaning or तात्पर्य of the ज्ञानकाण्ड that all Upanishadic sentences are closely related in their meaning to the all-pervading ब्रह्मन् alone. § The above rules of मीमांसा are also very useful in determining the purport of the धर्मशास्त्र (law); while in the case of secular (लौकिक) sentences contained in poetry and other forms of literature the purport is determined by means of प्रकरण (context), औचित्य (propriety), देश (place), काल (time) etc., as referred to above.

Here अभेदरत्नकार says that though the apprehension of purport (तात्पर्यज्ञान) is necessary for verbal comprehension at particular places, it is not required for every verbal comprehension. He further adds that when there arises a doubt about the purport of a passage or when it is certain that there is the total absence of purport, no verbal comprehension is possible. But if in the beginning we are in doubt about the purport and if afterwards we gradually determine the purport, verbal compre-

§ सर्वेषु वेदान्तेषु वाक्यानि तात्पर्येणैतस्यैवार्थस्य प्रतिपादकत्वेन समनुगतानि । –ब्र. सू. भाष्य, १.१.४.

hension is possible. In other words, the knowledge of purport becomes the cause of verbal comprehension after the period of doubt If we are doubtful as to whether a sentence means this or that, the knowledge of तात्पर्य helps us to understand the unified sense of that sentence Or, if we misunderstand the view of a speaker or writer, the knowledge of purport is useful for removing our misunderstanding. It is, therefore, not true that all verbal comprehension takes place only after the knowledge of तात्पर्य [वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४]

It may be said in connection with the above view that students learning a language like Sanskrit are always in doubt regarding the purport of a sentence, verse or paragraph of the book they read It is, therefore, desirable to remove this doubt by telling the purport and facilitating verbal comprehension *before* and *after* the detailed study of a thought-unit With this end in view Shastris usually tell the purport twice, before and after the detailed study of a passage, and Sanskrit commentators supply in their commentaries अवतरणिकाs or introductory remarks containing the purport of sentences and paragraphs of the original texts This procedure in oral teaching or in written commentaries really helps the analytico-synthetic or intensive study of literature and Shastras in the following way The detailed study of a passage enables the teacher and the taught to *analyse* the principal and subordinate parts of sentences conveying corresponding ideas; while the purport told at the beginning and end of

the detailed study maintains *synthesis* of ideas. The telling of the purport (तात्पर्यकथन), as adopted by Shastris in their teaching is, therefore, a wise plan worthy of being followed by all teachers of Sanskrit. The teacher may either *tell* this purport to students or may elicit it from them through suitable questions. Any way, due attention to the *Purport* must always be paid by the teacher in the teaching of *prose* rather than of poetry.

It has been observed above that the वेदान्तिन्स accepting शक्ति (power) as a distinct category give a rigidly technical definition of तात्पर्य as "the inherent capacity of words to produce the cognition of a particular meaning." The नैयायिक्स, however, do not accept शक्ति as a distinct category, but identify it with the will or intention (इच्छा) of God or a human speaker. This is why they define तात्पर्य as "the *intention* or *will* of the speaker." With the exception of words reproduced by a parrot, an idiot, a Vedic priest or a gramophone it may be generalized that intention is a predominant factor of any speech or writing. Although there is no intention in a parrot, an idiot, a gramophone or a book itself, yet the original speaker or writer whose words are reproduced or recorded by each of the above has definitely an intention. Unless words are uttered with a conscious purpose or intention, they cannot be meaningful. It is only due to the speaker's intention that peculiar words acquire peculiar meanings in different contexts. There is, therefore, much truth in the definition of

तात्पर्य given by the नैयायिकs, though that definition might be faulty from a strictly scientific point of view While dealing with equivocal words and adding the qualification 'तदन्यप्रतीती-छयाऽनुच्चरितत्वम्' (non-utterance with the intention of conveying any other meaning) to their own definition of तात्पर्य even the वेदान्तिन्s indirectly acknowledge the factor of intention Hence the definition of the नैयायिकs is serviceable for all practical purposes Although the sentences repeated by a parrot or an idiot are not uttered with the intention or desire of communication, yet it cannot be said that Vedic sentences mechanically repeated by priests and speeches or songs recorded by gramophones are not uttered with a desire of communication It is then found that Vedic sentences etc., are uttered with the desire of communicating their meaning to the hearer, and that the knowledge of तात्पर्य is the cause of understanding the meaning arising from sentences desired to be communicated That तात्पर्य is contained in the intention of the speaker or writer is a well-known fact Nothing, therefore, can be gained except contradiction to this well-known fact in formulating a rigidly technical definition of तात्पर्य as the वेदान्तिन्s do As the cases where the intention of the speaker is absent are rare, it is preferable to accept for practical purposes the definition of तात्पर्य as formulated by the नैयायिकs and to pay due attention to the intention of the speaker or writer in language-study The knowledge of तात्पर्य is, therefore,

the cause of verbal comprehension which arises from a sentence desired to be communicated.

XV. IMPLICATION (लक्षणा)

Sometimes peculiar words in a sentence stand in the way of understanding its general purport (तात्पर्य). We are, therefore, required to understand those words in a sense other than the primary one (वाच्य, शक्य) for the purpose of making them suit the context or purport. Thus when after hearing or reading a word in a sentence we have to abandon its primary sense (मुख्यार्थबाध) on account of its inapplicability to or incompatibility with (अनुपपत्ति) the other words or context of that sentence, and when we accept there another (implied) sense, which is in some way related to the primary sense (योग, शक्यसम्बन्ध), we have to resort to the process called Implication or लक्षणा. In other words, लक्षणा occurs when the primary sense, which is opposed to some means of knowledge like 'direct perception' (प्रत्यक्षप्रमाण), cannot be accepted, and when, for the suitability of the context, we have to suppose another meaning which is related to the express or primary meaning. For instance, in the sentence 'गङ्गायां घोषः' (A hamlet is situated on the Ganges) the primary meaning of the word 'गङ्गा' is 'गङ्गाप्रवाह' (the stream of the Ganges) which first arises in our mind; but this meaning is opposed to the direct

perception, as the hamlet cannot be situated on the *stream*. The purport of the speaker in uttering the sentence is that we should understand the meaning 'गङ्गातट' (the bank of the Ganges) from the word 'गङ्गा', and not the express meaning 'प्रवाह' (the stream) which is incompatible with the purport. *We, therefore, abandon the primary or express* meaning 'the stream' and understand the *implied* or *secondary* meaning 'the bank' which is related to the primary meaning 'the stream'. We understand the implied meaning (लक्ष्यार्थ) 'bank' from the word 'गङ्गा' according to the following *psychological* process—

The Knowledge of 'the bank' does not first arise in our mind but arises after the knowledge of the primary meaning 'stream'. We first know the word 'गङ्गा' and its primary meaning 'stream', after which we understand the implication that the express meaning 'stream' is related to 'the bank' through the relation of proximity (सामीप्य) or conjunction (संयोग). Here, according to the *mental law of association* that the knowledge of one thing leads to the memory of another thing related to it, $ we recollect the *bank*. We have already seen that there is a relation (सम्बन्ध) between a word and its meaning, and that the two related things (सम्बन्धी) showing that relation are a word and its meaning. When one related thing, i. e., a word is known, we can recollect another related thing, i., e, the mean-

$ एकसम्बन्धिज्ञानमपरसम्बन्धिस्मारकम् ।

ing. Here, according to this mental law the knowledge of the one related thing, i. e., the word 'गङ्गा' which also contains the implied meaning 'bank' through its relation of conjunction or proximity to the primary meaning 'stream', leads us to recollect the other related thing, viz, the implied meaning 'bank.' Thus from the whole sentence 'गङ्गायां घोषः' we understand by Implication (लक्षणा) the reasonable sense that the hamlet is situated on the *bank* (गङ्गातटे घोषः). Here the relation of the word 'गङ्गा' with its primary meaning 'stream' is *direct* and with the secondary meaning 'bank' it is *indirect* (परम्परासम्बन्ध), since the word 'गङ्गा' is directly related to the primary meaning 'stream' which is again related to the secondary meaning 'bank'. लक्षणावृत्ति thus occurs when the relation of a word is understood *indirectly through the primary meaning*. The relation of conjunction (संयोग) between the primary meaning 'stream' and the secondary meaning 'bank' is here called लक्षणा or Implication.† Although this relation of conjunction is originally between the *things* 'गङ्गा' and 'तट', i. e., between 'the stream' and 'the bank' and not between the *words* 'गङ्गा' and 'तट', yet the word 'गङ्गा' is indirectly related to the word 'तट'. Thus the knowledge of 'the bank' being derived from implication (लक्षणा), the meaning 'bank' becomes 'लक्ष्य' (the thing implied). The well-known meaning of a word is its express or primary

† लक्षणा शक्यसम्बन्धस्तात्पर्यानुपपत्तितः ।—भाषापरिच्छेदः, ८२

meaning, yet when this meaning is incompatiable with the context, we invariably resort to लक्षणा. The implied meaning (लक्ष्यार्थ) is, however, of secondary importance as compared to the express meaning. Of course, if the purport of the speaker can be ascertained by means of the primary meanings of words, it is not proper to resort to लक्षणा and accept the secondary meaning

Now wherein does the incompatibility (अनुपपत्ति), which is the essential condition of Implication (लक्षणा बीज), lie? Does it lie in अन्वयानुपपत्ति (Incompatibility of ascertaining the logical or syntactical relation) or in तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति (Incompatibility of ascertaining the *Purport of the speaker*)? *Here, some schools, the* प्राचीननैयायिकs and the आलङ्कारिकs, for instance, say that अन्वयानुपपत्ति is the essential condition of लक्षणा. But instead of regarding अन्वयानुपपत्ति as a separate condition of Implication it is better, according to other schools like the नव्यनैयायिकs and the वेदान्तिन्s to regard तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति as the essential condition in all cases, and include the former in the latter The reasons for this are as follows—

For example, in the sentence 'यष्टीः प्रवेशय' (Admit the sticks into the dining room) there would be no necessity of resorting to Implication For, it being possible to admit the sticks into the room, the logical connection (अन्वय) between 'प्रवेशय' and the primary meaning of 'यष्टीः' (sticks) can be well established Hence अन्वयानुपपत्ति which is supposed to be the essential condition of Implication does not occur in

this sentence. On the other hand, there is तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति here, since the purport of the speaker is not that 'sticks' (primary meaning) should be admitted, but it is that '*ascetics* with sticks' (यष्टिधरा:) should be admitted for dining. If the primary meaning of 'यष्टी:' (sticks) would be accepted here, it would be impossible to serve food to the sticks. This incompatibility can be removed by taking the implied meaning of 'यष्टी:' as 'यष्टिधरान्' (ascetics with sticks). The implication is thus rooted in तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति and we, therefore, take the sentence 'यष्टी: प्रवेशय' to mean 'यष्टिधरान् प्रवेशय' (The ascetics with sticks should be admitted).

Again, in the sentence 'काकेभ्यो दधि रक्ष्यताम्' (Protect the curds from the crows) it is possible to establish the syntactical relation (अन्वय) between 'रक्ष्यताम्' and 'काकेभ्य:', the primary meaning of which is 'crows'. If we shall understand from this sentence that *animals other than the crows* may be allowed to spoil the curds, then we might miss the purport of the speaker. According to the purport of the speaker we should not merely understand the primary meaning 'crows' from the word 'काकेभ्य:' but should also take by implication *all creatures* that spoil the curds (दध्युपघातका: प्राणिन:). For, the purport of the speaker here is that the curds should be protected from *all creatures.* If we would take simply the primary meaning 'crows', there would be तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति which can be removed by resorting to लक्षणा and understanding that the

curds should be protected not only from the crows but from all creatures.

Similarly, in the sentence 'छत्रिणो यान्ति' (The men with umbrellas are going) we are not to understand *from the word* 'छत्रिन' *merely its primary* meaning, viz, 'men with umbrellas', but also to understand by implication 'the collection of all men with and without umbrellas', since the purport of the speaker is to make us know the latter meaning which is implied If simply the primary meaning of 'छत्रिण' *be taken, there would be* तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति which can be removed by taking the latter meaning.

Again, in the sentence 'विष भुङ्क्ष्व' (Eat poison) the logical relation (अन्वय) of the primary meanings of the words 'विषम्' and 'भुङ्क्ष्व', i e, of the object and the verb respectively, can be well established, though the eating of poison will surely result in death The father's intended meaning (तात्पर्य), however, in saying this sentence to his son is not that he should eat poison which causes death The intended meaning is that the son should desist from dining at the house of the enemy. For all these reasons the condition of the incompatibility of establishing the *logical relation* (अन्वयानुपपत्तिर्लक्षणा-बीजम्) being non-pervasive (अव्याप्त), it is necessary to accept the incompatibility of ascertaining the Purport as the essential condition of Implication (तात्पर्यानुपपत्तिर्लक्षणाबीजम्).

Moreover, all sentences in which there is अन्वयानुपपत्ति can be shown *to involve* तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति also.

The sentence 'गङ्गाया घोषः' is generally quoted as an example of अन्वयानुपपत्ति. The आलङ्कारिक say here that the primary (express) meaning of the word 'गङ्गा' viz., 'the stream' cannot be logically connected with the meaning of 'घोष' (a hamlet) and that the implied meaning 'bank' should be understood from the word 'गङ्गा'. But this is an example as much of तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति as of अन्वयानुपपत्ति. For, if we take the primary meaning of the word 'गङ्गा', the sentence is also incapable of yielding the purport, which should imply 'the bank'. It is, therefore, better, according to the law of parsimony (लाघव) to take तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति as the only essential condition of Implication. There are several factors that determine the purport of a sentence. Thus in the example 'गङ्गाया घोषः' अन्वयानुपपत्ति is helpful as a factor of determining the Purport, in 'काकेभ्यो दधि रक्ष्यताम्' non-accomplishment of purpose (प्रयोजनासिद्धि) is helpful and in 'सैन्धवमानय' etc., context (प्रकरण), time (काल), and place (देश) are helpful in determining the purport.

If only अन्वयानुपपत्ति be supposed to be the cause of implication, another fault occurs as follows.—In the sentence 'गङ्गाया घोषः', the speaker purports that we should understand 'the bank' from the word 'गङ्गा', and we do understand actually that 'the bank' is implied by the word 'गङ्गा'. Now if the speaker purports that we should understand the meaning 'fish' from the word 'घोष', the implied meaning of 'घोष' would be 'a fish'. This rule for

understanding the speaker's purport would be violated if अन्वयानुपपत्ति would be supposed to be the condition of Implication For, *there would be no* criterion to decide when the word 'गङ्गा' should imply 'the bank' and when the word 'घोष' should imply 'a fish'. For *this reason it is necessary to* accept the incompatibility of ascertaining the purport (तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति) as the only cause of Implication. *In* short, the knowledge of *the speaker's* purport leads us to understand the implied meaning (लक्ष्यार्थ). [सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि, वेदान्तपरिभाषा.]

लक्षणा is divided into several varieties by the आलङ्कारिकs, नैयायिकs and वेदान्तिन्s according to different principles of division and the peculiar process involved in each variety. The most important and common varieties that are *indispensable to the expounding and understanding of the inner spirit of literature* and शास्त्रs may be noted as follows—

मम्मट *gives the third condition of लक्षणा* as 'रूढि प्रयोजनान्यतरत्' meaning thereby that along with the two conditions 'मुख्यार्थबाध' and 'तद्योग' either 'established usage' (रूढि) or '*a definite motive or purpose*' (प्रयोजन) must justify a लक्षणा. The first variety is, therefore, *called by him* 'निरूढलक्षणा' and the second 'प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा'. He, from a scientific point of view, accepts निरूढलक्षणा in the case of words like 'कुशल', which etymologically (कुशान् लातीति) and hence *primarily* means 'दर्भग्रहीता' (one who handles कुश

grass), and which through usage or *secondarily* means 'चतुर' (clever). The purpose of this लक्षणा, which is rooted in this etymological sense, might have been known by people in ancient times; yet it is forgotten by us now owing to the रूढि (convention, usage) of the word 'कुशल' in the sense of 'चतुर', *which we now take as the primary* meaning of that word. The same may be said about the word 'लावण्य' which etymologically means 'saltiness' (लवणस्य भावः) and conventionally or primarily means 'beauty'. All similar words like 'तैलम्' (तिलस्य विकारः), द्विरेफः (द्वौ रेफौ यस्य) etc., are now understood by us in their conventional and hence primary senses through usage, and their etymological senses are known by few persons. As we now take the conventional senses of those words to be primary, it is unnecessary for all practical purposes to resort to लक्षणा in the case of those conventional (रूढ) words. This is why साहित्यदर्पणकार and हेमचन्द्र are inclined not to recognize निरूढलक्षणा in the case of the above words, and there is some truth in their view.†

If निरूढलक्षणा is left out, all other varieties of लक्षणा are found to proceed from a definite purpose or motive and are, therefore, collectively termed 'प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा'. For instance, there is a definite

---

† कुशलादिरूपार्थस्य व्युत्पत्तिलभ्यत्वेऽपि दक्षरूपस्यैव मुख्यार्थत्वात्। अन्यद्धि शब्दानां व्युत्पत्तिनिमित्तमन्यच्च प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तम्। —साहित्यदर्पणः, २
कुशलद्विरेफादयस्तु साक्षात्सङ्केतितविषयतया मुख्या एवेति न रूढिर्लक्षणायां हेतुत्वेनास्माभिरुक्ता। —काव्यानुशासनम्, १ (पृ. २५)

purpose of लक्षणा in the use of the sentence 'गङ्गायां घोषः' and it is in *suggesting* the *extreme* coolness and purity of the bank and of the hamlet situated on it. Although the sentence 'गङ्गातट घोष' is capable of suggesting these qualities, yet it is unnecessary to resort to लक्षणा in it Moreover, the *excess* or *abundance* of these qualities is not so much suggested by the word 'तट' in the sentence 'गङ्गातटे घोष' as it is done by the peculiar mode of the word 'गङ्गा' in 'गङ्गायां घोष'. The word 'गङ्गा' can imply not only 'the bank' but can also suggest a third sense, viz, 'coolness and sanctity' (शैत्यपावनत्व) of गङ्गा in an excessive degree Thus the suggestion of the excess of 'coolness and sanctity' which really belongs to the stream, but which is transferred to 'the hamlet' (घोष) through association, is the motive or purpose of लक्षणा in the sentence 'गङ्गायां घोष' It may then generally be said that the definite purpose of प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा is to help the *process of suggestion* (व्यञ्जना) and suggest a third sense, which is the same as the purpose and other than the express (वाच्य) and implied (लक्ष्य) senses. This suggestion depends, of course, upon the individual frame of mind of which one is possessed, and it is, therefore, subjective rather than objective

Now the *mental process* involved in प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा leading to व्यञ्जना (suggestion) is this — In all the varieties of प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा the understanding of the purpose (प्रयोजन), which is in the form of

'suggestion', depends upon the *consciousness of identity* (अभेदप्रतिपत्ति) between the primary sense (वाच्यार्थ) and the secondary sense (लक्ष्यार्थ) This consciousness of identity leads us to *transfer* the characteristics (धर्म) of the primary sense to the secondary sense This transfer further makes possible the *association* of those characteristics with the secondary sense, and the association then enables us to understand the *purpose* in the form of 'suggestion'. For instance, in 'गङ्गाया घोष' when the identity of the primary sense 'stream' and the the secondary sense 'bank' is realized, we transfer the characteristics of 'coolness and sanctity' belonging to 'the stream' to 'the bank', and the association of 'coolness and sanctity' with the bank makes us conscious of the purpose of लक्षणा, viz, the suggestion of 'coolness and sanctity' attaching to the bank and the hamlet.

प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा is divided into two main varieties viz, शुद्धा (Pure) and गौणी (Qualitative) In शुद्धा लक्षणा there is the absence of 'उपचार' which, in its restricted sense, means 'the secondary use of a word' owing to similarity between its primary sense (वाच्यार्थ) and implied sense (लक्ष्यार्थ). We must remember here that 'उपचार' in its wider sense means the *secondary or figurative use of a word*, and such उपचार being present in all varieties of लक्षणा (even in शुद्धा लक्षणा) becomes an equivalent of लक्षणा, since लक्षणा also is the secondary or figurative use of a word The word 'उपचार' in this wider sense is used

in different systems of Hindu philosophy. But the distinction between शुद्धा लक्षणा and गौणी लक्षणा without being based on this wider *sense* of उपचार is based on its *restricted sense*. In शुद्धा लक्षणा, therefore, the primary sense and the implied sense of a word have between themselves a relation which is other than that of similarity (सादृश्येतरसम्बन्ध). Some of the numerous relations other than the one of similarity are—(i) conjunction or association (संयोग or साहचर्य) as between 'कुन्ताः' (lances) and 'कुन्तिनः' (lancers) in the example 'कुन्ताः प्रविशन्ति', (ii) proximity (सामीप्य) as between the *stream* and the *bank* in the example 'गङ्गायां घोषः', (iii) effect and cause (कार्यकारणभाव) as between 'long life' and 'life-prolonging property' (ghee) in the example 'आयुर्घृतम्', (iv) subserviency or serving the purpose of another (तादर्थ्य), as between 'इन्द्र' and the 'post (स्थूणा) serving the purpose of इन्द्र' in the example 'यजमान इन्द्र (स्थूणां) पूजयति', etc.

In the other main variety of प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा, viz., the गौणी लक्षणा there is the presence of 'उपचार' in its restricted sense. In other words, there is the secondary use of a word in it owing to the *relation of similarity or extreme resemblance* (सादृश्येन सम्बन्धेन प्रवृत्तिः) between its primary sense and implied sense. 'गौणी' (qualitative) etymologically means 'one which proceeds from qualities' (गुणेभ्य आगता) that are common to the primary sense and the implied sense. For example, in the case of the *words* 'चन्द्रः' and 'अग्निः' that are

उपचरित or लाक्षणिक (figuratively used) in the sentences 'मुखं चन्द्रः' and 'माणवकः अग्निः', there is the relation of similarity between the primary senses of those words, viz., 'the moon' and 'fire', and the secondary senses of the same, viz., 'the face' and 'the boy' respectively. The identity between 'चन्द्र' and मुखम्' or 'माणवकः and अग्निः' is then felt by us owing to the *extreme resemblance of their qualities*, though the primary sense and the secondary sense of 'चन्द्रः' and 'अग्निः' are quite separate things.

There are four subdivisions of शुद्धा लक्षणा, viz., उपादान, लक्षण, सारोपा and साध्यवसाना, which are dealt with in their order as follows—

(1) उपादानलक्षणा (Inclusive implication), which is also called अजहत्स्वार्था or अजहल्लक्षणा, is that in which there is the *inclusion* or acceptance (उपादान) of the primary sense in the implied sense. In other words, उपादानलक्षणा is that in which the primary sense accepts an additional sense for the purpose of establishing itself (primary sense) in the context of a sentence. In this लक्षणा the primary sense of a word is not given up (न जहाति पद स्वार्थं यस्याम्) but in combination with the additional sense it is included in the implied sense. Thus the sentences—यष्टयः (यष्टिधराः पुरुषाः) प्रविशन्ति, कुन्ताः (कुन्तिनः पुरुषाः) प्रविशन्ति, श्वेतः (अश्वः) धावति, काकेभ्यः (दध्युपघातकेभ्यः) दधि रक्ष्यताम्, छत्रिणः (छत्रिणोऽच्छत्रिणश्च) यान्ति, are all examples of the inclusion of the primary senses of the words in bold type, along with additional senses, in their implied senses.

(ii) लक्षणलक्षणा (Exclusive implication), otherwise called *जहत्स्वार्था or जहल्लक्षणा*, is that in which there is the *exclusion* or abandonment of the primary sense, which being incompatible with the context of a sentence *indicates* (लक्षणेन उपलक्षिता) another *sense* connected with it so as to suit the context of that sentence For instance, in the sentences 'गङ्गायां (गङ्गातटे) घोष ' and 'मञ्चाः (मञ्चस्था. बालका) क्रोशन्ति ' (The children on the cots cry), the primary senses of the words 'गङ्गा' (stream) and 'मञ्चा' (cots) are excluded or given up in order to point out the implied senses 'bank' and 'children on the cots' respectively

In connection with these two sub-divisions of शुद्धा लक्षणा, an independent variety 'जहदजहल्लक्षणा' (*Quasi-inclusive or partial implication*), *otherwise* named 'भागलक्षणा' or 'भागत्यागलक्षणा', may be mentioned Though this variety has not been recognized by *the आलङ्कारिक*s *or the नैयायिक*s, *it is usually resorted* to by the वेदान्तिन्s for establishing the identity of the Individual Soul with the Universal Soul while expounding the great Vedic dictum 'तत्त्वमसि' (Thou art That) Thus जहदजहल्लक्षणा occurs when a word signifying some qualified entity (विशिष्ट) abandons one part of its primary sense and retains another part *

---

* यत्र हि विशिष्टवाचक शब्दः एकदेश विहाय एकदेशे वर्तते तत्र जहदजहल्लक्षणा, यथा 'सोऽय देवदत्त' इति । —वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४

जहदजहतीति सा स्याद्या वाच्यार्थैकदेशमपहाय ।
बोधयति चैकदेश सोऽय द्विज इतिवदाश्रयेदेनाम् ॥

शङ्कराचार्यकृत स्वात्मनिरूपणम्, ३५

For instance, in the sentence 'सोऽयं देवदत्त.' (This is that देवदत्त) the two qualified entities signified by the words 'स.' and 'अयम्' referring respectively to देवदत्त *of the past time* and देवदत्त *of the present time* cannot be identical. The two words, however, refer to the same विशेष्य or substantive, viz., the individual देवदत्त, who is unrelated to time, past and present. When, therefore, the identity of the qualified entities is not possible, the part consisting of attributes (विशेषण) of these entities is abandoned and the part indicating the substantive is retained or accepted. Thus the attributes or qualifications *of the past time'* and *'of the present time'* being abandoned, the substantive 'देवदत्त' is retained for establishing the unity of देवदत्त. Similarly, when in the sentence 'तत्त्वमसि' [Thou (जीव) art That (ईश्वर)] we eliminate parts of the primary senses of 'Thou' and 'That', viz, the adjuncts or qualifications 'limited intelligence' (किञ्चिज्ज्ञत्व) and 'omniscience' (सर्वज्ञत्व) of जीव and ईश्वर respectively, Pure Consciousness common to जीव and ईश्वर is left, and the difference between both of them being annihilated, the identity of both is established

(iii) Now सारोपा लक्षणा (Superimponent Implication), the third sub-division of शुद्धा as recognized by the आलङ्कारिकs, involves the process of superimposition (आरोप) of one thing on the other. The सारोपा लक्षणा, therefore, occurs when the object of superimposition (विषय—आरोपाश्रय) is identified with the thing

taken in (अन्तःकृत) by the thing superimposed viz., 'आयु:'; and it is only the word 'आयु:' that is expressed. Again, as already stated, there is the causal relation between the primary sense and the implied sense of the word 'आयु:'.

Now the गौणी लक्षणा has only two varieties viz., (a) सारोप and (b) साध्यवसान, and the examples of both of them are 'वाहीको गौः' and 'अयं गौः' or 'गौर्वदति' respectively. Here we identify 'वाहीकः' (विषय–उपमेय) with 'गौः' (विषयी–उपमान), as both of them possess the common qualities of 'dullness and stupidity' (जाड्यमान्द्यादि). In the first example, i. e., of the गौणी सारोप both the object of superimposition or the thing compared (विषय–उपमेय) and the thing superimposed or the standard of comparison (विषयी–उपमान) are *separately mentioned*; while in the examples of गौणसाध्यवसान they (विषय and विषयी) are *not separately mentioned*, the विषय or उपमेय being swallowed (निगीर्ण) by the विषयी or उपमान. We have already seen that the गौणी लक्षणा occurs when the primary sense (वाच्यार्थ) and the implied sense (लक्ष्यार्थ) of a लाक्षणिक word are found to possess *similar qualities* (गुण), or when there is the relation of *similarity* between the वाच्यार्थ and लक्ष्यार्थ. In other words, the primary sense is found to possess the same qualities as those possessed by the implied sense. In the sentence 'वाहीको गौः' there is the relation of similarity between the primary sense 'bull' of the उपचरित or लाक्षणिक word 'गौः' and its implied sense 'वाहीकः', since

the primary sense 'bull' possesses the same qualities of 'dullness' etc., as are possessed by the implied sense 'वाहीकः'. Thus the लाक्षणिक word 'गौः' implies 'a man possessed of dullness', i. e., 'वाहीकः' on account of similarity between 'गौः' and 'वाहीकः'. As both these words are in the same case (समानाधिकरण), they signify one and the same person and hence yield one and the same sense (एकार्थाभिधायक). Other examples of the गौणसारोपलक्षणा are 'माणवकोऽग्निः' and 'मुख चन्द्रः' or 'मुखचन्द्र उदेति', and those of the गौणसाध्यवसानलक्षणा are 'अग्निः कुप्यति' or 'चन्द्र उदेति'. From all such examples we find that the गौणसारोपलक्षणा is at the basis of the figure रूपक and the गौणसाध्यवसानलक्षणा is at the basis of अतिशयोक्ति, otherwise called रूपकातिशयोक्ति. In both the गौणसारोपा and गौणसाध्यवसाना we seek to suggest the identity of the विषय (उपमेय) with the विषयी (उपमान). But in the गौणसारोपा the extreme similarity between the विषय and the विषयी leads us to realize the identity of both, though they are mentioned separately; while in the गौणसाध्यवसाना the sense of similarity reaches such a point that the विषय is thought to be the विषयी itself. This is why the word standing for the विषय is swallowed and hence not expressed.

Authors like कुमारिल distinguish गौणी वृत्ति from लक्षणा by saying that लक्षणा occurs when there is the apprehension of the secondary sense which is *merely connected* with the primary sense, i. e, when the connection between the primary sense and the

implied sense is other than that of similarity, and that गौणी वृत्ति occurs when the connection between the वाच्यार्थ and लक्ष्यार्थ is through the *qualities* of the thing implied, i e, when there is the *connection of similarity* between वाच्यार्थ and लक्ष्यार्थ $ The *examples of गौणी वृत्ति usually quoted are* 'माणवकोऽग्नि', 'देवदत्त सिंह' etc In these examples the primary senses of 'अग्नि' and 'सिंह' are 'fire' and 'lion' respectively As these senses are incompatible with the Purport of the sentences, i e, as the primary senses of these words cannot be properly connected with 'माणवक' and 'देवदत्त' respectively, we have to resort to लक्षणा Now the implied senses of 'अग्नि' and '*सिंह*' *are respectively* '*a boy with the qualities* of fire (brightness, etc)' and 'देवदत्त possessing the qualities of a lion (bravery, etc)' Thus the connection between 'माणवक and अग्नि' or 'देवदत्त and सिंह' is established through their *common qualities* But, as has already been shown, this गौणी वृत्ति of कुमारिल is the same as the गौणी लक्षणा of मम्मट, and the लक्षणा of the former is nothing but the शुद्धा लक्षणा of the latter. Thus मम्मट takes गौणी वृत्ति to be a division of लक्षणा and not an independent function as कुमारिल does It is, therefore, unnecessary to hold *लक्षणा and गौणी वृत्ति to be separate functions*

$ अभिधेयाविनाभूतप्रतीतिर्लक्षणोच्यते ।
लक्ष्यमाणगुणैर्योगाद् वृत्तेरिष्टा तु गौणता ॥

Quoted in the काव्यप्रकाश from the तन्त्रवार्तिक.

It has already been shown that the consciousness of identity (अभेदप्रतिपत्ति) between the primary sense and the implied sense of a लाक्षणिक word is indispensable to the understanding of the *purpose* (प्रयोजन) of all the varieties of प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा viz., शुद्धा and गौणी. This means that the feeling of identity leading to the understanding of the purpose is as much necessary in the case of उपादानलक्षणा and लक्षणलक्षणा as it is in the case of the सारोप and साध्यवसान varieties of both शुद्धालक्षणा and गौणलक्षणा. Generally the purpose of लक्षणा being closely related to the primary sense is felt by us in association with the implied sense We must, therefore, realize the identity between the primary sense and the implied sense in order that the characteristics of the former should be associated with the latter But mere perception of the relation between the primary sense and the implied sense cannot make us alive to the *Purpose* For example, the sentence 'गङ्गातटे घोष' does not suggest the Purpose in the form of 'coolness and sanctity' that are associated with the bank, even though we can perceive the relation between 'गङ्गा' and 'तट'. On the other hand, in the sentence 'गङ्गाया घोष.', which is an example of लक्षणलक्षणा, the लाक्षणिक word 'गङ्गा' helps us to feel the identity between its primary sense 'stream' and the implied sense 'bank'; and this feeling of indentity further becomes a step to the *Suggestion of the Purpose* viz., 'coolness and sanctity' in association with the bank.

and the hamlet situated on it. Coolness and sanctity are really the characteristics of the 'stream' and not of the 'bank'. When, however, the identity between the primary sense 'stream' and the implied sense 'bank' is felt by us, these characteristics can be associated with the bank. Similarly, in the sentence 'कुन्ताः प्रविशन्ति', which is an example of उपादान लक्षणा, the feeling of identity between the primary sense (lances) of the word 'कुन्ताः' and its implied sense (lancers) becomes a step to the understanding of the Purpose, which is to *suggest* the sharpness and harshness of lancers. This purpose is understood, when, after the consciousness of identity between 'lances' and 'lancers', we associate the characteristics of sharpness etc., really belonging to 'lances' (primary sense) with 'lancers' (implied sense). Thus even in उपादानलक्षणा and लक्षणलक्षणा, the varieties of शुद्धा, we must feel identity between the primary sense and the implied sense. Yet in both these varieties of शुद्धा the identity between the वाच्यार्थ and लक्ष्यार्थ is not prominently felt by us until we begin to think of the Purpose, which is other than that identity. Hence the identity in उपादानलक्षणा and लक्षणलक्षणा being indirectly felt becomes a step to the understanding of the Purpose.

Now the *Purpose* in 'घृतमायुः', which is an example of शुद्धसारोपलक्षणा, is the *suggestion* that ghee is superior to the other articles of food in bringing about its desired result (अन्यवैलक्षण्येन कार्यकारित्वम्); while in 'आयुः पिबति', which is an example of शुद्ध-

साध्यवसानलक्षणा, the purpose is the *suggestion* that ghee invariably brings about its desired result (अव्यभिचारेण कार्यकारित्वम्), since complete identity between ghee and life is shown through the introsusception (अध्यवसान) of the word 'घृतम्' by the word 'आयु' In both these varieties of शुद्धा, the superimposition (आरोप) in 'घृतमायु' and the introsuception (अध्यवसान) in 'आयु पिबति' make the identity between 'घृतम्' and 'आयु' *more perceptible than* that in उपादानलक्षणा and लक्षणलक्षणा

On the other hand in गौणसारोपलक्षणा the purpose is the apprehension of identity between the विषय and the विषयी, even though the distinction between the two is felt by us owing to *their* separate mention For example, in the sentence 'वाहीको गौ' the difference between 'वाहीक' (विषय) and 'गौ' (विषयी) can be observed by us on account of the distinct mention of the two In spite of this difference the identity of the two is felt by us in consequence of the same case-relation (सामानाधिकरण्य) of those two words. This consciousness of identity between the विषय and the विषयी, in spite of their difference, is itself the Purpose of गौणसारोपलक्षणा in all *its* examples like 'वाहीको गौ', 'मुख चन्द्र', 'माणवकोऽग्नि' etc Again, in गौणसाध्यवसान लक्षणा the Purpose is the apprehension of *complete identity* between the विषय and the विषयी on account of the introsusception of the former by the latter For instance, in the sentence 'गौर्वदति' complete identity between 'वाहीक.' and 'गौ.' is felt, since the विषय

(वाहीक) has been swallowed by the विषयी (गौ) This consciousness of *complete identify* between the विषय and the विषयी is itself the purpose of गौणसाध्यवसान लक्षणा in all its examples like 'गौर्वाहीकः', 'चन्द्र उदेति', 'अग्नि कुप्यति' etc Thus the purposes of गौणसारोपलक्षणा and गौणसाध्यवसानलक्षणा are common to all their respective examples, since the गौणी लक्षणा in general proceeds from the *relation of similarity* alone †

Although the consciousness of identity (अभेद-प्रतिपत्ति) between the primary sense and the implied sense is a necessary factor common to all varieties of प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा, a distinction between शुद्धा लक्षणा and गौणी लक्षणा may be observed While the sense of identity in शुद्धा लक्षणा is only *a step* or *means* to the understanding of the Purpose which is different from that identity, the sense of identity itself in गौणी लक्षणा becomes the Purpose In other words, the identity in शुद्धा is *indirectly felt* and has to be apprehended for the sake of the Purpose, which is something else, while the identity in गौणी लक्षणा is prominently or *directly felt* and itself occupies the position of the Purpose A still more subtle distinction between उपादानलक्षणा and लक्षणलक्षणा on the one hand and सारोपलक्षणा and साध्यवसानलक्षणा on the other, may be noted that in the former the sense of identity being indirectly felt becomes a step to the apprehension of the Purpose, while in the latter the sense of

---

†अत्र गौणभेदयोर्भेदेऽपि ताद्रूप्यप्रतीतिः सर्वथैवाभेदावगमश्च प्रयोजनम् । शुद्ध-भेदयोस्त्वन्यवैलक्षण्येन अव्यभिचारेण च कार्यकारित्वम् ।—काव्यप्रकाश , उ.२.

identity being directly felt occupies the position of the Purpose on account of the process of superimposition (आरोप) and introsusception (अध्यवसान).

XVI. SUGGESTION (व्यञ्जना)

We have seen that every variety of the प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा is accompanied by a purpose (प्रयोजन) which being different from the communication of 'the primary sense' and 'the implied sense' is understood through the process of *Suggestion* (व्यञ्जना). In the sentence 'गङ्गायां घोषः' the primary sense of the word 'गङ्गा' is 'the stream' and its implied sense is 'the bank'; but the peculiar use of the लाक्षणिक word 'गङ्गा' in the sentence enables us to understand the additional sense 'coolness and sanctity', which is other than the primary and implied ones, and which is, therefore, conveyed to us through no other process than that of Suggestion. This suggested sense becomes manifest to us when we understand the speaker's *purpose* or *intention*, which is to suggest that the pleasant properties of 'coolness and sanctity' really belonging to the stream are associated with or possessed by the bank. Hence the suggested sense which itself is the purpose of लक्षणा is different from the primary sense 'stream' and the implied sense 'bank'. Thus for understanding the Purpose of the speaker we must

postulate a third function called 'व्यञ्जना' or 'ध्वनि' (Suggestion) in addition to the functions of अभिधा (Expression) and लक्षणा (Implication) Unless the Purpose contains a beautiful idea, the suggested sense is not prominently felt by us in poetry. The speaker's purpose in using the sentence 'गङ्गाया घोष' is to suggest 'the extreme coolness and sanctity of the bank' and unlike the primary sense and the implied sense this suggested sense contains *a delightful idea*, which appeals to our emotions rather than to our Reason. This beautiful sense or purpose is, therefore, conveyed to us by the only process of व्यञ्जना, which is, *the mental process of the pleasant and immediate association of ideas* apart from words. The purpose of the speaker is sometimes to convey his ideas directly through Expression (अभिधा) and sometimes he skilfully conceals that purpose in such a way that it should be circumstantially realized by the hearer. This is why the purpose containing a beautiful idea is *suggested* rather than expressed. Hence the suggested sense (ध्वनि), which is superior to the expressed and implied senses, is held to be the distinguishing mark of excellent poetry.

Western psychologists include 'Suggestion' under 'Mimesis' which means 'imitation' in a wider sense In the psychology of the group 'mimesis' is said to be a manifestation of the gregarious (social) instinct, the three aspects of which are 'sympathy', 'suggestion' and 'imitation'. 'Sympathy' is imitation in *feeling*, 'Suggestion' is

imitation in *ideas* or *thought*, and 'imitation' in its narrow sense is imitation in *action*. When two or more persons come together so as to form 'a psychological group', these three aspects of 'mimesis' are set in motion. These three aspects are so closely related to one another, that when one aspect is at work, another is aroused, because there is close relation between subtle suggestion and feeling These aspects stand both on the instinctive (unwitting) as well as conscious levels. Of them Suggestion is the unwitting acceptance of the ideas of others McDougall defines Suggestion as "a process of communication resulting in the acceptance with conviction of the communicated proposition in the absence of logically adequate grounds for its acceptance"$ As suggestion is unwitting in the case of the person who accepts the ideas, the instinct of 'submission' is aroused in him, while in the superior person who suggests the ideas, the process of suggestion may be conscious or deliberate If we apply these psychological facts to a good poet and his reader, we find that the poet, who has an artistic or literary interest in Suggestion, consciously or purposefully suggests beautiful ideas, though while actually composing poetry he forgets himself and is one with the emotions and ideas, the 'constructive instinct' being aroused in him, while in the reader who appreciates or admires his ideas unwittingly or without logical discrimination, the instincts of 'submission' and

$ An Introduction to Social Psychology by McDougall, p 83.

'curiosity' are awakened. Thus the process of suggestion working in the poet as well as in the reader being closely related to Feeling gives rise to the feelings of *Sympathy* and admiration in the latter.

The Sanskrit term for Suggestion in poetry is 'ध्वनि' which is used by आनन्दवर्धन, the first exponent of the ध्वनि-theory, in his ध्वन्यालोक. It is, he says, borrowed from the grammarians, who, as we have already seen, employ it for the audible and non-eternal sounds (ध्वनि) that *suggest* the eternal स्फोट.$ Although the ध्वनिवादिन्s do not recognize the theory of स्फोट on account of their acceplance of the suggestiveness of words as well as their parts, yet by the analogy of the *suggestiveness* of non-eternal words as held by the grammarians, they employ the term 'ध्वनि' to connote the wider significance of the suggestiveness of *words* as well as their *senses*. Thus the term 'ध्वनि' of the ध्वनिवादिन्s widely includes its various connotations, viz., suggestive words, their expressed senses which are suggestive, suggested sense, function of suggestion, and suggestive poetry. As in all good poetry prominence is found to be given to the ध्वनि or व्यङ्ग्यार्थ (suggested sense) in relation to which a word and its expressed sense occupy a subordinate position, आनन्दवर्धन establishes

---

$ ते (वैयाकरणाः) च श्रूयमाणेषु वर्णेषु ध्वनिरिति व्यवहरन्ति। तथैवान्यैस्तन्मतानुसारिभिः सूरिभिः काव्यतत्त्वार्थदर्शिभिर्वाच्यवाचकसम्मिश्रः शब्दात्मा काव्यमिति व्यपदेश्यो व्यञ्जकत्वसाम्याद् ध्वनिरित्युक्तः।
(ध्वन्यालोकः, १।१६).

the *synthetic principle of criticism that* ध्वनि *is the soul of poetry* † Further, this ध्वनि-theory naturally leads आनन्दवर्धन and his illustrious commentator अभिनवगुप्त to the *psychological exposition of the theory of* रस. They, therefore, establish the aesthetic principle that रसध्वनि (suggestion of sentiments) is the foremost of all the varieties of ध्वनि, and that अलङ्कार (figures of speech), गुण (excellences), रीति (style), वस्तु (plot), etc, must all subserve the main purpose of the development of रस. This is predominantly *a synthetic method of the criticism of literature.*

Now the suggested sense (ध्वनि or व्यङ्ग्यार्थ) cannot be conveyed by the power of अभिधा (Expression). For, the अभिधा establishes a direct and conventional relation between an already existing thing and the words denoting it, and after it has performed its function of denoting one conventional sense, it is exhausted * A *separate function must, therefore,* be postulated for the purpose of conveying a sense other than the primary or conventional one, and it is performed by the suggestive power residing in the expressed sense of words. Hence we find that the suggested sense is indirectly related to words; and if it is supposed that it is directly related, the existence of a sense other than the primary one

† यत्रार्थः शब्दो वा तमर्थमुपसर्जनीकृतस्वार्थौ । व्यङ्क्तः काव्यविशेषः स ध्वनिरिति सूरिभिः कथितः ॥ (ध्वन्यालोक, १।१३).

* विशेष्यं नाभिधा गच्छेत् क्षीणशक्तिर्विशेषणे । —काव्यप्रकाशः, २।५

would never be possible † If thus the suggestive power resides in the expressed sense of words, the suggested sense cannot be apprehended by us unless we first know the whole expressed sense and the words denoting it.$ At such places the expressed *sense of words with their various aspects, viz, their* syllables, order, etc, becomes instrumental to the apprehension of the suggested sense which is principal Here the expressed sense without being cancelled helps the manifestation of the suggested sense. The variety of ध्वनि that occurs in this case is called 'विवक्षितान्यपरवाच्य' (in which the expressed sense is meant for the sake of another-suggested-sense) or 'अभिधामूल' (based on Expression) It may be noted that in this variety of ध्वनि the suggested sense is indirectly related to words The subdivisions of this variety of ध्वनि are 'संलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्य' and 'असंलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्य' or 'रसध्वनि'. The *mental process* involved in both is this —In the former the graded steps of realizing the suggested sense from the expressed sense can be well ascertained; whereas in the latter *the understanding of the expressed sense* in the form of the representation of the विभाव (causes of emotions or determinants), अनुभाव (after-effects of emotions or consequents)

---

† वाच्यो ह्यर्थो न साक्षाद्व्यङ्ग्यस्य सम्बन्धी। तदितरस्त्वभिधेयसामर्थ्याक्षिप्तः सम्बन्धिसम्बन्धी। यदि च स्वसम्बन्धित्वं साक्षादस्य स्यात्, तदार्थान्तरसंक्रमितत्वमेव न स्यात्। —ध्वन्यालोक, २।२२

$ वाच्यार्थप्रतीतिपूर्विका व्यङ्ग्यार्थस्य प्रतिपत्तिः। — ध्वन्यालोक, १।१०

and व्यभिचारिभावs (transient emotions)§ awakens without well discernible steps or immediately the स्थायिभावs (permanent moods) latent in us, and instantly gives rise to the रस which is the suggested sense Although there are some intermediate steps between the understanding of the expressed sense and the realization of the रस here, yet the process takes place so quickly that the steps cannot be perceived and the suggestion of the रस appears to be instantaneous †

An example of the संलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्य is found in the sixth canto of the कुमारसम्भव. When the divine sages approached the father of पार्वती and when अङ्गिरस्, their leader, requested him to offer पार्वती in marriage to शिव, पार्वती who was inwardly delighted at this proposal, is described as follows—

एवंवादिनि देवर्षौ पार्श्वे पितुरधोमुखी ।
लीलाकमलपत्राणि गणयामास पार्वती ॥ –कुमार० ६।८४

' When the heavenly sage (अङ्गिरस्) spoke thus, पार्वती, who was by the side of her father, counted the petals of her play-lotus with a down-cast look "

Here, though पार्वती was pleased in her mind, she could not, out of bashfulness, display her love

§ Read pages 136–143

† न हि विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिण एव रसा इति कस्यचिदवगमः । अत एव च विभावादिप्रतीत्यविनाभाविनी रसादीनां प्रतीतिरिति तत्प्रतीत्योः कार्यकारणभावेन व्यवस्थानात् क्रमोऽवश्यंभावी । स तु लाघवान्न प्रकाश्यते 'इत्यलक्ष्यक्रमा एव सन्तो व्यङ्ग्या रसादयः' इत्युक्तम् ।

–ध्वन्यालोक, ३।३३

for शिव in the presence of the elderly persons She, therefore, tried to conceal her feelings by pretending to count the petals with a down-cast look. Here, पार्वती's transient emotion (व्यभिचारिभाव) 'bashfulness' (लज्जा) is suggested.$ This suggestion is realized by us when, after understanding the expressed sense which is subordinated, we take into account पार्वती's former love for शिव, the mention of शिव as the proposed husband, and पार्वती's counting of petals with a down-cast look This suggestion of the व्यभिचारिभाव appeals to us through these clearly perceptible stages and not immediately after the understanding of the expressed sense For, the counting of petals with a down-cast look may also take place on account of circumstances other than bashfulness Thus in order to realize the suggestion of this bashfulness we have to undergo the stages, viz, पार्वती's love for शिव, her penance, शिव's mention, etc.

An example of the असंलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्य occurs in the *third canto of the कुमारसम्भव. In the former part of this* canto the following incidents have been described. मदन in order to excite the love of शिव for पार्वती goes with his friend वसन्त (the Vernal Season) to the place where शिव is practising penance. पार्वती, who is in the prime of her youth, is attending upon शिव out of love for him. She offers to शिव a rosary of

---

$ अत्र हि लीलाकमलपत्रगणनमुपसर्जनीकृतस्वरूपं शब्दव्यापारं विनैवार्थान्तरं व्यभिचारिभावलक्षणं प्रकाशयति। —ध्वन्यालोक, २।२१

lotus-seeds which he accepts through love. At the very moment मदन is ready to discharge his arrow on शिव, who is then described as follows—

हरस्तु किञ्चित्परिलुप्तधैर्यश्चन्द्रोदयारम्भ इवाम्बुराशिः ।
उमामुखे बिम्बफलाधरोष्ठे व्यापारयामास विलोचनानि ॥

" शिव, *slightly losing his firmness like the ocean* at the rising of the moon, cast his eyes on पार्वती's face with its lower lip like the Bimba fruit."

In this verse the स्थायिभाव (permanent mood) is the love (रति) of शिव, the आलम्बनविभाव (fundamental determinant) is पार्वती, the उद्दीपनविभाव (excitant determinants) are the vernal season and the darting of the arrow by मदन, and the अनुभाव (consequent emotions) are शिव's loss of firmness and his glance at पार्वती's face This representation of the विभाव and अनुभाव suddenly or without discernible steps suggests to the reader the व्यभिचारिभाव (transient emotions), viz., eagerness, joy, agitation, etc, which give the suggestion of शृङ्गाररस.† It will thus be found that the अभिधा-power of words is inadequate to convey the inner sentiments (रस), which can only be *suggested* by means of the skilful and

† यत्र साक्षाच्छब्दनिवेदितेभ्यो विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिभ्यो रसादीनां प्रतीतिः, स तस्य (असंलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्यस्य) केवलस्य मार्गः । यथा कुमारसम्भवे मधुप्रसङ्गे वसन्तपुष्पाभरणं वहन्त्या देव्या आगमनादिवर्णनं मनोभवशरसन्धानपर्यन्तं, शम्भोश्च परिवृत्तधैर्यस्य चेष्टाविशेषवर्णनादि, साक्षाच्छब्दनिवेदितम् ।–ध्वन्यालोक., २।२३.

harmonious delineation of the विभावs etc.$ This is the chief variety of suggestion called 'रसध्वनि', where the ध्वनि–theory being happily blended with the रस–theory culminates in the latter.

The variety named 'संलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्य' is again subdivided into वस्तुध्वनि (suggestion of an idea or fact) and अलङ्कारध्वनि (suggestion of a figure of speech). The suggested sense of fact (वस्तुध्वनि) is so different from the expressed sense that when the former is negative, the latter is positive and *vice versa.** It must be noted that the अलङ्कारs cannot go beyond beautifying words and their expressed sense. Their real function, according to आनन्दवर्धन, is to serve the purpose of the development of रस (ध्व. २।१७). अभिनवगुप्त, therefore, says that रसध्वनि is really the soul of poetry and that वस्तुध्वनि and अलङ्कारध्वनि wholly terminate in the development of रस. Yet as these two varieties of ध्वनि are superior to the expressed sense, they are included under the comprehensive term 'ध्वनि', and a general statement is made by आनन्दवर्धन that Suggestion is the soul of poetry.†

$ तृतीयस्तु रसादिलक्षणो न तु साक्षाच्छब्दव्यापारविषय इति वाच्याद्विभिन्न एव। ... यतश्च स्वाभिधानमन्तरेण केवलेभ्योऽपि विभावादिभ्यो विशिष्टेभ्यो रसादीनां प्रतीतिः।–ध्वन्यालोकः, १।४.

* आद्यः (वस्तुध्वनिः) तावत्प्रभेदो वाच्याद्दूरं विभेदवान्। स कदाचिद्वाच्ये विधिरूपे प्रतिषेधरूपः। क्वचिद्वाच्ये प्रतिषेधरूपे विधिरूपः।-ध्वन्यालोकः, १।४.

† रस एव वस्तुत आत्मा, वस्त्वलङ्कारध्वनी तु सर्वथा रसं प्रति पर्यवस्येते इति वाच्यादुत्कृष्टौ तावित्यभिप्रायेण ध्वनिः काव्यस्यात्मेति सामान्येनोक्तम्। —ध्वन्यालोकलोचनम्, १।५.

harmonious delineation of the विभावs etc. $ This is the chief variety of suggestion called 'रसध्वनि', where the ध्वनि–theory being happily blended with the रस–theory culminates in the latter

The variety named 'संलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्य' is again subdivided into वस्तुध्वनि (suggestion of an idea or fact) and अलङ्कारध्वनि (suggestion of a figure of speech). The suggested sense of fact (वस्तुध्वनि) is so different from the expressed sense that when the former is negative, the latter is positive and *vice versa*.* It must be noted that the अलङ्कारs cannot go beyond beautifying words and their expressed sense. Their real function, according to आनन्दवर्धन, is to serve the purpose of the development of रस (ध्व २।१७) अभिनवगुप्त, therefore, says that रसध्वनि is really the soul of poetry and that वस्तुध्वनि and अलङ्कारध्वनि wholly terminate in the development of रस Yet as these two varieties of ध्वनि are superior to the expressed sense, they are included under the comprehensive term 'ध्वनि', and a general statement is made by आनन्दवर्धन that Suggestion is the soul of poetry.†

$ तृतीयस्तु रसादिलक्षणो न तु साक्षाच्छब्दव्यापारविषय इति वाच्याद्विभिन्न एव। ... यतश्च स्वाभिधानमन्तरेण केवलेभ्योऽपि विभावादिभ्यो विशिष्टेभ्यो रसादीनां प्रतीति. ।–ध्वन्यालोक,' १।४.

* आद्यः (वस्तुध्वनि) तावत्प्रभेदो वाच्याद्दूरं विभेदवान्। स कदाचिद्वाच्ये विधिरूपे प्रतिषेधरूप। कश्चिद्वाच्ये प्रतिषेधरूपे विधिरूप.। -ध्वन्यालोक, १।४.

† रस एव वस्तुत आत्मा, वस्त्वलङ्कारध्वनी तु सर्वथा रस प्रति पर्यवस्येते इति वाच्यादुत्कृष्टौ तावित्यभिप्रायेण ध्वनि. काव्यस्यात्मेति सामान्येनोक्तम्।

–ध्वन्यालोकलोचनम्, १।५.

the person addressed, the sentence, the proximity of another person, the expressed sense, the occasion, the place, the time, the intonation or gestures,§ and affords free scope for the imagination of the reader. This व्यञ्जना is called 'आर्थी', since the sense of words in it is more important than particular words, i. e, words in it are capable of being exchanged for synonyms (पर्यायपरिवृत्तिसह).

Moreover, the *expressed sense* exists only in individual words, while the suggested sense shines through words, their syllables, a sentence, a mode of expression (सङ्घटना) or *the whole poetic composition,* and thus presents a *synthetic aspect* to the whole meaning of the poet † Lastly, the expressed *sense relating itself to the already existing* things appeals only to our understanding, whereas, the suggested sense prominently appeals to our *emotions* and brings instantly before our inner vision 'the light that never was on sea or land.' $ It will thus be clear that owing to the insufficiency of the function of अभिधा, it is not possible to realize the suggested sense simply by knowing the meanings of words from a dictionary, or by studying

---

§ काव्यप्रकाश (३।१-२) and साहित्यदर्पण (२।१६-१७).

† यस्त्वलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्यो ध्वनिर्वर्णपदादिषु ।
वाक्ये सङ्घटनायां च स प्रबन्धेऽपि दीप्यते ॥ -ध्वन्यालोकः, ३।२.

$ तद्वत्सचेतसां सोऽर्थो वाच्यार्थविमुखात्मनाम् ।
बुद्धौ तत्त्वार्थदर्शिन्यां झटित्येवावभासते ॥ -ध्व. १।१२.

grammar. The suggested sense (ध्वनि) can be appreciated only by a man of fine literary taste (सहृदय).§

व्यञ्जना differs from लक्षणा just as it differs from अभिधा. If it is supposed that in 'गङ्गायां घोषः' the Purpose (प्रयोजन), which is conveyed by the suggested sense 'coolness and sanctity', is conveyed by लक्षणा, we shall have to adopt a second लक्षणा in order to imply that Purpose. After the adoption of the first लक्षणा, the sentence 'गङ्गायां घोषः' assumes the form of 'गङ्गातटे घोषः'. Now, if a second लक्षणा is adopted here, the three conditions of लक्षणा are not fulfilled. For, 'गङ्गातट' is not the primary sense of the word 'गङ्गा' but the secondary one, which is not inapplicable to the present context. Secondly, the properties of 'coolness and sanctity' are connected with the *stream* and not with the *bank*. Thirdly, popular usage (रूढि) does not allow us to use the word 'तट' in order to imply the properties of coolness and sanctity. Moreover, there is no second प्रयोजन which will enable us to understand the first प्रयोजन by *implication*. If the second प्रयोजन is supposed to exist, a third प्रयोजन will have to be supposed for the *implication* of the second प्रयोजन, and so on *ad infinitum*. The three conditions of लक्षणा thus not being fulfilled, the प्रयोजन of the first लक्षणा cannot be implied by a second लक्षणा, but can be *suggested* by

§ शब्दार्थशासनज्ञानमात्रेणैव न वेद्यते ।
वेद्यते स तु काव्यार्थतत्त्वज्ञैरेव केवलम् ॥ ध्व. १।७.

the power of व्यञ्जना alone. But even in the absence of the three conditions of लक्षणा, the word 'गङ्गा' itself is not unable to communicate the प्रयोजन 'coolness and sanctity', which is conveyed by the independent function of व्यञ्जना.$ The function of लक्षणा ceases after conveying the implied sense 'bank'; and the प्रयोजन in the form of 'coolness and sanctity' can be apprehended by व्यञ्जना alone. व्यञ्जना may sometimes depend upon लक्षणा as in the case of 'लक्षणामूलव्यञ्जना' (suggestion based upon Implication'; yet व्यञ्जना is not the same as लक्षणा which, just like अभिधा, is only a means to the apprehension of the suggested sense.

Some ancient आलङ्कारिक्स identify ध्वनि (व्यञ्जना) with भक्ति (लक्षणा), and deny the existence of the former. 'भक्ति' is to be understood here in the sense of 'उपचार',* which in its restricted sense means 'the secondary use of a word proceeding from extreme similarity.' This भक्ति or गुणवृत्ति (secondary function) is, therefore, the same as the गौणी लक्षणा (Qualitative Implication) formerly dealt with. Both भक्ति (गौणलक्षणा) and लक्षणा or शुद्धलक्षणा (Pure Implication) can thus be included under the general term 'लक्षणा' and can be

$ (अ) लक्ष्य न मुख्य नाप्यत्र बाधो योग. फलेन नो।
न प्रयोजनमेतस्मिन्न च शब्द. स्खलद्गति. ॥ –काव्यप्रकाशः, २।११.
(आ) मुख्यां वृत्ति परित्यज्य गुणवृत्त्यार्थदर्शनम्।
यदुद्दिश्य फल, तत्र शब्दो नैव स्खलद्गति. ॥ –ध्व. १।२०.

* उपचारमात्र तु भक्ति' । ध्व. १।१७.

differentiated from व्यञ्जना. आनन्दवर्धन says here that लक्षणा and ध्वनि differ from each other with regard to their nature and subject-matter. The difference in their nature is that लक्षणा is the process of understanding the secondary sense of a word after *cancelling* its primary sense; while व्यञ्जना is the process of apprehending the suggested sense, which being the principal one does not necessarily discard the primary sense of a word. For, the sense derived from the suggestion of रस, etc., can never be a secondary one. Again, as लक्षणा is based only on the primary sense of a word, it is, as some people say, merely an extension or tail of Expression (अभिधापुच्छ); while ध्वनि, which depends only upon the suggestiveness of words, is quite different from their expressiveness. § Another distinction between both of them is that in लक्षणा, when the expressed sense loses itself in favour of the secondary one, the former itself is developed into the latter and ceases there only; while in व्यञ्जना, when the expressed sense suggests another sense, it illuminates itself as well as the suggested sense, just as a lamp illuminates itself and other objects.$ For instance, the expressed sense of the verse 'लीलाकमलपत्राणि गणयामास पार्वती' makes itself known to us and suggests

§ वाचकत्वाश्रयेणैव गुणवृत्तिर्व्यवस्थिता ।
व्यञ्जकत्वैकमूलस्य ध्वनेः स्याल्लक्षणं कथम् ॥—ध्व. १।२१.

$ व्यञ्जकत्वमार्गे तु यदाऽर्थोऽर्थान्तरं द्योतयति, तदा स्वरूपं प्रकाशयन्नेवासावन्यस्य प्रकाशकः प्रतीयते प्रदीपवत् । —ध्व. ३।३३.

the bashfulness of पार्वती. Here the expressed sense, without being discarded, is suggestive of the other sense of bashfulness. If it is supposed to be understood by Implication, there would be the contingency of taking the subordinate function of लक्षणा to be the principal one. For, sentences generally possess an independent *synthetic sense* apart from the expressed senses of individual words, which light up that synthetic sense. The expressed sense can become suggestive only when words are modified by the peculiarity of the speaker, context, and the like. The suggested sense thus aided by words becomes prominent and principal. Yet this principal sense yielded by the function of Suggestion cannot be identified with the primary sense, which is yielded by the function of अभिधा. For, अभिधा is based upon convention, while व्यञ्जना depends upon the peculiarity of the speaker, etc, and reveals a unique sense.

Even the topics of लक्षणा and व्यञ्जना are manifestly different. The subject-matter of लक्षणा is only an ordinary fact (वस्तु) which is understood after cancelling the primary sense and making the implied sense compatible with the senses of other words in a sentence On the other hand, there are three topics that come under the domain of व्यञ्जना, viz, रस, particular अलङ्कारs and वस्तु that can be *suggested* rather than implied The suggested sense is, therefore, that which is not derived from the cancellation of the primary sense, which

is not conventional, and which is distinct from any other sense. It is impossible to say that the realization of रस and others is a secondary function like that of लक्षणा. The suggested sense is likewise that which, incapable of being conveyed by words, is desired to be communicated for the purpose of realizing its inherent charm. In other words, ध्वनि consists in the prominent manifestation of a charming sense that cannot be conveyed by any means other than suggestive words.† It should be incidentally noted that a slight concealment and suggestion of the poet's purpose lend charm to his poetry.§ It cannot be said that all this charm comes within the purview of लक्षणा. For, भक्ति or लक्षणा is found to be employed even when the suggested sense is not charming or is not meant to be conveyed. All examples of the secondary use of words proceeding from रूढि, as 'लावण्यम्', 'कर्मणि कुशलः', 'कलिङ्गः साहसिकः', 'ग्रामः पलायितः', etc., do not contain any purpose. Even though in examples like 'श्वेतो धावति', 'कुन्ताः प्रविशन्ति', 'मञ्चाः क्रोशन्ति' some purpose may be detected, yet that purpose does not comprise any beautiful idea. Poets are also found to make a secondary use of words without any special purpose of *suggesting* a charming idea. For instance, in the line, 'कृशाङ्ग्याः सन्तापं वदति बिसिनीपत्रशयनम्' [The bed of lotus-leaves *speaks for*, i. e., shows the torment of

† इत्थमन्यानपेक्ष्यस्य यत् तस्यार्थं प्रकाशयन् ।
शब्दो व्यञ्जकतां बिभ्रद् ध्वन्युक्तेर्विषयी भवेत् ॥ —ध्व. १।१८.

§ अर्थो गिरामपिहितः पिहितश्च कश्चित् । सौभाग्यमेति मरहट्टवधूकुचाभः ॥

the lady with a slender frame] the secondary use of the word 'वृद्धि' *does not suggest a specially* charming idea. In all these cases लक्षणा is employed even in the absence of a special purpose. It can, therefore, be clearly distinguished from व्यञ्जना.

Although व्यञ्जना is thus distinct from अभिधा and लक्षणा, it depends upon both of them. Suggestiveness sometimes rests on the expressiveness of *words, as in the variety of* ध्वनि called 'विवक्षितान्यपरवाच्य', *where, as we have already seen, there is* no scope for लक्षणा; and sometimes it resorts to the secondary significance of words, as in the other variety of ध्वनि named 'अविवक्षितवाच्य', where the *expressed sense is not desired to be communicated* and is hence *discarded*. *This latter variety of* ध्वनि is, *therefore, otherwise termed* 'लक्षणामूलव्यञ्जना' or Suggestion based upon Implication.

The following verse is an example of the अविवक्षितवाच्यध्वनि or लक्षणामूलव्यञ्जना—

> सुवर्णपुष्पं पृथिवीं चिन्वन्ति पुरुषास्त्रयः ।
> शूरश्च कृतविद्यश्च यश्च जानाति सेवितुम् ॥

"Three persons gather *gold flowers* from the extensive earth—the brave, the learned and one who knows how to serve."

As gold flowers cannot be found on the earth, the word 'सुवर्णपुष्पम्' here is incompatible with *the sense of 'gathering'*. The primary sense of *that word not being meant here* (अविवक्षितवाच्य) *is to be dropped in favour of another sense bearing resemblance to it, viz., 'abundant wealth'.*

This suggestion, therefore, depends upon लक्षणा on the word 'सुवर्णपुष्पम्'.

Another example of the same variety is—

धृतिः क्षमा दया शौचं कारुण्यं वागनिष्ठुरा ।
मित्राणां चानभिद्रोहः सप्तैताः समिधः श्रियः ॥

"Fortitude, forgiveness, mercy, purity of mind, compassion, gentle words and non-injury to friends-these seven are the *sacrificial fuel* of wealth."

Here, the primary sense of the word 'समिधः' (fuel) is incompatible with 'wealth', because wealth can neither be increased by fuel nor can it blaze like fire. The literal sense is, therefore, to be dropped and another sense similar to it, viz., 'that which increases or promotes' is to be understood from the word 'समिधः' so as to suit the context, just as we do in the example 'आयुर्घृतम्'. This suggestion, which is realized by us from the word 'समिधः', is based upon लक्षणा. The word 'समिधः' again suggests one more happy idea that wealth must be acquired by fair means and used for good purposes, just as the sacred fire kindled with sacrificial sticks is to be kept up for holy purposes.

The अविवक्षितवाच्यध्वनि is further classified into two sub-divisions, viz., अत्यन्ततिरस्कृतवाच्य and अर्थान्तरसंक्रमितवाच्य. In the former, the primary sense of a word being incompatible is *completely discarded* in favour of some suggested sense; while in the latter, the primary sense, though not incompatible with the context, is transferred to the suggestion of

some other beautiful sense. The following verse, which describes राम's affliction caused by his separation from सीता, is an example of both these subdivisions. राम says—

> स्निग्धश्यामलकान्तिलिप्तवियतो वेल्लद्बलाका घनाः
> वाताः शीकरिणः पयोदसुहृदामानन्दकेकाः कलाः ।
> कामं सन्तु दृढं कठोरहृदयो रामोऽस्मि सर्वं सहे
> वैदेही तु कथं भविष्यति हहा हा देवि धीरा भव ॥
>
> —ध्वन्यालोकः, २

"Let there be clouds that have *besmeared* (pervaded) the sky with their oily and dark-blue lustre and that have cranes moving about sportively in them; let there be winds mixed with water-drops; let there be the joyful and sweet cries of the *friends* of clouds (peacocks). I, hard-hearted *Rama*, can bear all this; but what will be the condition of वैदेही now? Alas! 'Oh lady, have courage!"

In this verse the primary sense of the word 'लिप्त' (besmeared) has to be discarded completely and the other qualitatively similar sense 'व्याप्त' (pervaded) has to be understood in its stead, since it is impossible to besmear the formless sky with anything. Again, as it is impossible to have friendship with inanimate clouds, the expressed sense of 'सुहृदाम्' (friends) has to be abandoned completely and the other sense 'peacocks' has to be understood on account of the connection of 'सुहृदाम्' with 'केका' (the cry of a peacock). Thus the suggestion of the other senses is awakened in us when the expressed senses of 'लिप्त' and 'सुहृद्' are

completely discarded' (अत्यन्ततिरस्कृतवाच्य) But in the use of the word ' राम ' there is the suggestion called ' अर्थान्तरसङ्क्रमितवाच्य '. The expressed sense of the word ' राम ' is ' the son of दशरथ, ' and this sense is not incompatible with the context. Yet the propriety of that word is understood when we transfer this expressed sense to the realization of the suggested sense, viz, ' राम who is patient in spite of the calamities of forest life'. When this sense appeals to us, we know why राम can stand all the sights and sounds of the rainy season, though they are excitant of his emotion of love for सीता.

आनन्दवर्धन recognizes the fact that his predecessors like उद्भट and वामन slightly touched the principle of ध्वनि. For, they admit that भक्ति, a variety of लक्षणा, is based upon the relation of extreme resemblance or identity between the expressed sense and the secondary sense, and hence conduces much to poetic charm $ Thus भक्ति, otherwise called ' वक्रोक्ति ' by वामन,* is found to stand just on the border of ध्वनि. Yet आनन्दवर्धन contends that these predecessors could not define this poetic mode in precise terms, and erred in taking it to be a second-

$ यद्यपि च ध्वनिशब्दसंकीर्तनेन काव्यलक्षणविधायिभिर्गुणवृत्तिरन्यो वा न कश्चित्प्रकारः प्रकाशितः, तथापि अमुख्यवृत्त्या काव्येषु व्यवहारं दर्शयता ध्वनिमार्गो मनाक्स्पृष्टोऽपि न लक्षित इति परिकल्प्यैवमुक्तम्— ' भाक्तमाहुस्तमन्ये ' इति। —ध्व. १।१.

* सादृश्याल्लक्षणा वक्रोक्तिः। (वामन—काव्यालङ्कारसूत्रम् ४।३।८).

ary function and in not recognizing its distinct value as a form of ध्वनि. We have already seen that it is chiefly the purpose of the poet that makes us seek similarity or identity between 'विषय' and 'विषयी', and use words in a sense other than the primary one. As in भक्ति or गौणलक्षणा the extreme similarity or identity itself assumes the prominent position of the purpose which develops into the suggested sense, it is not proper to call this merely a secondary function. It is, therefore, advisable to give this poetic mode a place under the prominent function of Suggestion and call it 'अविवक्षितवाच्यध्वनि'. आनन्दवर्धन, therefore, says that it does not matter if भक्ति or लक्षणा becomes occasionally a distinguishing mark (उपलक्षण) of only the variety named 'अविवक्षितवाच्य'. Thereby लक्षणा is not exalted nor is ध्वनि rendered useless § Thus though व्यञ्जना depends upon both अभिधा and लक्षणा, it cannot be identified with either of them, since there are other varieties of ध्वनि in which neither अभिधा nor लक्षणा is present. As sometimes in the अविवक्षितवाच्य variety, ध्वनि is based upon लक्षणा, it cannot be identical with अभिधा. Again, as in the विवक्षितान्यपरवाच्य variety ध्वनि is found to rest on अभिधा and not on लक्षणा, it cannot be identical with लक्षणा. Nor can we say that because ध्वनि partakes of the characteristics of both अभिधा and लक्षणा, it is identical with both. For, व्यञ्जना also exists in the

§ कस्यचिद् ध्वनिभेदस्य सा तु स्यादुपलक्षणम् ।
लक्षणेऽन्यै कृते चास्य पक्षसंसिद्धिरेव न ॥ —ध्व. १।१२.

tunes of music which are free from the processes of अभिधा and लक्षणा. It has already been shown that tunes of music are suggestive of sentiments. Again, suggestiveness exists not only in sounds but also in silent gestures. Although suggestion sometimes seeks the aid of गुणवृत्ति (secondary signification) or लक्षणा, yet a clear distinction must be observed between गुणवृत्ति (लक्षणा) that is employed without a special purpose or charming sense and the same resorted to for the special purpose of suggesting a beautiful idea. Wherever it (गुणवृत्ति) becomes the cause of apprehending a charming suggestive sense, it does not do so on its own merits but only on the merits of *suggestiveness*. Just as the expressed sense of 'गतोऽस्तमर्कः' (The sun has set) becomes charming not on account of the power of अभिधा, but on the merits of its various suggestions occurring to different people, so the गुणवृत्ति or लक्षणा also becomes charming owing to its suggestive power alone. In the verse 'सुवर्णपुष्पां पृथिवीम्' etc., where the expressed sense of the word 'सुवर्णपुष्पम्' is discarded, the suggestion of the pleasing sense referred to above is the only motive. It is then reasonable to say in general that even when such use of secondary signification is made, it should be understood as the process of व्यञ्जना and not that of लक्षणा. It must, therefore, be concluded that in both the sub-divisions of अविवक्षितवाच्यध्वनि the secondary signification is qualified by the common characteristic of suggestiveness. That signification should be differentiated from the secondary

signification without the above qualification of 'suggestiveness', since the latter does not yield a suggested sense, which would gladden the hearts of connoisseurs. [ध्वन्यालोक, उद्योत १ and ३]

व्यञ्जना should also be distinguished from तात्पर्य. तात्पर्यवृत्ति, as has formerly been shown, *is postulated* by the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s for the purpose of *understanding* the synthetic sense of a whole sentence, and is held to be a function distinct from अभिधा and लक्षणा, which are concerned with individual words. The powers of अभिधा and लक्षणा, they say, are exhausted after yielding the expressed and implied senses of individual words. Hence the logical connection (अन्वय) of words in the form of the unified sense of a sentence is established, according to the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, by the separate power of तात्पर्य. The sense of a sentence (वाक्यार्थ) is principal (पर) in relation to the words contained in it, and words achieving that principal object (तत्पर=वाक्यार्थपर) are shown to have a logical relation among them on account of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and सन्निधि *by the separate function of* तात्पर्य. The generic senses of individual words are then turned into the specific sense of a sentence, which emerges from the intention or purpose of the speaker (वक्तुरिच्छा तात्पर्यम्) The अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, *therefore*, assert that the purpose of the speaker *is* conveyed by the तात्पर्यवृत्ति, and that it is unnecessary to take व्यञ्जना, which too is held to convey the

purpose, as a function separate from तात्पर्य. The rhetoricians, on the other hand, are generally unwilling to accept तात्पर्य as a separate function, and include it under the function of व्यञ्जना. This confusion about the identity of तात्पर्य and व्यञ्जना arises on account of a few common characteristics possessed by both. In the first place, both तात्पर्य and व्यञ्जना are said to manifest the purpose of the speaker. Secondly, both convey the principal sense with reference to the subordinate senses yielded by अभिधा and लक्षणा. Thirdly, both begin to function after the powers of अभिधा and लक्षणा are exhausted, though both of them depend upon अभिधा and लक्षणा. Fourthly, both are said to rely on the speciality of the speaker, context, etc., and require the aid of the determinants of the special meanings of words, viz, संयोग, विप्रयोग and others, as formerly referred to. Fifthly, both of them are found to convey the synthetic sense of a sentence, though व्यञ्जना sometimes yields the suggested sense of words and their syllables also. These common characteristics of both lead the मीमांसक to include व्यञ्जना in तात्पर्य and the rhetoricians to include तात्पर्य in व्यञ्जना according to the prominent part played by the word-aspect in their respective systems. मम्मट, however, seems to be the first rhetorician, who with clear insight makes a compromise between these two views. Whenever he has an occasion to refer to these two functions, he, instead of including तात्पर्य in व्यञ्जना, makes a separate mention of it along with

अभिधा, लक्षणा and व्यञ्जना.* This perhaps means that he wants to accept तात्पर्यवृत्ति, though with reservation, as a function distinct from व्यञ्जनावृत्ति. The necessity of recognizing तात्पर्यवृत्ति might have been felt by him for the reason that *it is तात्पर्यवृत्ति rather than व्यञ्जना-वृत्ति that is indispensable to the understanding of the purport of intellectual topics in शास्त्रs and prose works* Thus with the view of reserving the province of शास्त्रs and kindred subjects for तात्पर्यवृत्ति he invariably makes a separate mention of it On the other hand, in the case of emotional subjects like poetry he seems to think it preferable to give due importance to the function of व्यञ्जना rather than to that of तात्पर्य *The suggested* sense *manifested by व्यञ्जना is prominently emotional and culminates naturally in the* रसध्वनि, as remarked above It is, therefore, *quite necessary to distinguish this emotional process of व्यञ्जना from the intellectual* one *of* तात्पर्य. तात्पर्यवृत्ति can at *most* bind together the individual senses of words conveyed by अभिधा and लक्षणा, and can exhibit the synthetic sense or purpose *of ordinary thoughts and scientific subjects which* require the use of Reason for their grasp *It is,*

* तात्पर्यार्थोऽपि केषुचित् (का. प्र. २।६), तदादौ ये विशेषाः पाचनत्वादयस्ते चाभिधातात्पर्यलक्षणाभ्यो व्यापारान्तरेण गम्या (का. प्र. २।१८), अभिधातात्पर्यलक्षणात्मकव्यापारत्रयातिवर्ती ध्वननादिपर्यायो व्यापारोऽनपह्नवनीय एव (का. प्र. ५।४७), इति सिद्धमभिधातात्पर्य-लक्षणाव्यापारातिरिक्त ध्वननम् (शब्दव्यापारविचार).

however, inadequate to convey the suggested sense (ध्वनि) which awakens our emotions and imagination, and sometimes baffles verbal expression. In the apprehension of the suggested sense we have to undergo *three or four mental stages* The *first stage* is the recollection of the conventional or generic senses arising from words owing to the power of अभिधा. At the *second stage* the power of अभिधा being exhausted, the comprehension of the sense of the whole sentence takes place through the separate function of तात्पर्य, which establishes logical relation (संसर्ग, अन्वय) among the generic senses, transforms them into particular ones, and gives a peculiar form to the sense of the whole sentence. Thus the mutual relation, which itself assumes a peculiar form of the sense of the whole sentence owing to the तात्पर्यशक्ति, is not conveyed by the power of अभिधा, since the sense of a sentence is not the sense of individual words in it. If there is incompatibility of ascertaining the तात्पर्य, लक्षणा will perform its function, and after the removal of that incompatibility at the *third stage* the तात्पर्यार्थ will be re-established At the last or *fourth stage* when the sense of the whole sentence is understood, i e, when the तात्पर्यवृत्ति has exhausted its power, the suggested sense (ध्वनि) in poetry will arise. If thus the power of अभिधा is already exhausted at the second stage, how can it extend its function to the fourth stage of realizing the suggested sense ? If the function

of अभिधा *is distant from the function of* तात्पर्य, *it is* doubtless *more distant from the function of* व्यञ्जना which is remote from तात्पर्यवृत्ति* It will thus be clear that the function of तात्पर्य is exhausted merely in establishing the logical connection of the expressed and implied senses of words in a sentence and can lead us no further § It is only after we have uninterruptedly understood the sense of the whole sentence that we are enabled to realize the suggested sense The तात्पर्य may sometimes help the manifestation of the suggested sense, yet the suggested sense is unique in comparison with the तात्पर्यार्थ, just as the तात्पर्यार्थ is a new sense in comparison with the conventional sense of a word

The मीमांसक specify the meaning of तात्पर्य in the following way According to them a sentence is composed of two parts (the Subject and the Predicate) conveying respectively two kinds of sense, viz, भूत (सिद्ध) and भव्य (साध्य) The portion consisting of the Subject contains senses that are already

* अर्थशक्तिमूलेऽपि विशेषे सङ्केत. कर्तुं न युज्यते इति सामान्यरूपाणां पदार्थानामाकाङ्क्षासंनिधियोग्यतावशात्परस्परसंसर्गो यत्रापदार्थोऽपि विशेषरूपो वाक्यार्थस्तत्राभिहितान्वयवादे का वार्ता व्यङ्ग्यस्याभिधेयतायाम्। (काव्यप्रकाश , उ. ५, झळकीकरकृता टीका). See also the प्रदीप on this

§ विशेषरूपे वाक्यार्थे तात्पर्यशक्ति परस्परान्विते। प्रतिपत्तिश्चान्वयस्य नाभिधाशक्त्या, तस्या पदार्थप्रतिपत्त्युपायक्षीणाया विरम्याव्यापारादिति तात्पर्यशक्त्यैवान्वयप्रतिपत्ति। व्यापारश्च नाभिधात्मा, समयाभावात्। न तात्पर्यात्मा, तस्यान्वयप्रतीतावेव परिक्षयात्। —ध्वन्यालोकलोचनम्, १।४.

existent (सिद्ध) or obtained from other sources; while the part representing the Predicate comprises the senses that are yet to be brought into existence (साध्य). As the former portion is already known, any predication (विधान) with respect to it is thought to be useless; while the latter portion which is yet to be known is thought to be worthy of predication (विधेय). Thus in a sentence the former portion is used for completing the sense of the latter. The तात्पर्य of a sentence is then found only in this latter portion; and only that portion which contains the तात्पर्य is determined to be the sense of the whole sentence. A sentence is always employed to convey only this sense which is not yet known by other means. The latter portion is, therefore, held to be the criterion of understanding the unknown sense of that sentence and is hence predicated. For instance, in the sentence 'दध्ना जुहोति' (He offers sacrifice with curds) the 'offering' and the 'curds' are already known from other sources of knowledge; but the instrumentality (करणत्व) of 'दधि' with respect to 'हवन' (offering) is a fact yet to be known (साध्य). The तात्पर्य of this sentence, therefore, lies only in the instrumentality which is worthy of being predicated (विधेय).* This तात्पर्य again lies only in the

* 'भूतभव्यसमुच्चारणे भूतं भव्यायोपदिश्यते' इति कारकपदार्थाः क्रियापदार्थेनान्वीयमानाः प्रधानक्रियानिर्वर्तकस्वक्रियाभिसम्बन्धात् साध्यायमानतां प्राप्नुवन्ति, ततश्चादग्धदहनन्यायेन यावत्प्राप्तं तावद्विधीयते। यथा—हवनस्यान्यतः सिद्धेः 'दध्ना जुहोति' इत्यादौ दध्नः क…

sense of a word that is *pronounced* or *uttered*, and not in the sense that is known from any other relation or source of knowledge.

Of course, these peculiarities of the तात्पर्यार्थ evidently distinguish it from the suggested sense (ध्वनि) which is neither predicated nor pronounced by means of words. *Again, as the expressed senses* of words prominently come within the range of तात्पर्यवृत्ति, the unified sense of a sentence like 'गतोऽस्तमर्क' (The sun is set) yielded by it admits of no difference, but is uniform and fixed in spite of the diversity of the *speaker, context, etc*, and if the तात्पर्यार्थ might not be uniform and fixed, the purport of ordinary statements and शास्त्रs might be wrong or unintelligible. *It is, therefore, necessary* for all the शास्त्रs, which involve an intellectual process of thinking and reasoning, to yield one and the same meaning under varying circumstances † On the other hand, the *suggested* sense of the sentence 'गतोऽस्तमर्क' can be manifold according to the diversity of the speaker, context, etc, § and this manifoldness of the suggested sense instead of falsifying

विधेयम्। ... 'यदेव विधेय तत्रैव तात्पर्यम्' इत्युपात्तस्यैव शब्दस्यार्थे तात्पर्यम्, न तु प्रतीतमात्रे। –काव्यप्रकाश, उ ५ (झळकीकर, पृ २२६)

† शास्त्र हि सकृदुच्चारित समयबलेनार्थं प्रतिपादयद्युगपद्विरुद्धानेक समयस्मृत्ययोगात्कथमर्थद्वय प्रत्याययेत्। अविरुद्धत्वे वा तावानेको वाक्यार्थ स्यात्। क्रमेण विरम्यव्यापारायोग। पुनरुच्चारितेऽपि वाक्ये स एव, समयप्रकरणादेस्तादवस्थ्यात्। –ध्वन्यालोकलोचनम्, १।२१.

§ See 'काव्यप्रकाश', उ. ५ (झळकीकर, पृ २४०).

it enhances its *poetic charm*. Moreover, as we have already seen, the suggested sense, unlike the तात्पर्यार्थ, does not depend merely on words or sentences, but is manifested even by tunes and silent gestures. Thus the mental process involved in understanding the तात्पर्यार्थ is different from that involved in the realization of the व्यङ्ग्यार्थ. Although every sentence in language can be found to convey some purpose of the speaker, yet a distinction should be made between the purpose of thoughts contained in ordinary statements and शास्त्र on the one hand, and that of exquisite and emotional ideas in poetry on the other. The former may come within the range of तात्पर्यवृत्ति, whereas the latter deservedly belong to the domain of ध्वनि.

Now from the absolute (पारमार्थिक) point of view of the वेदान्तिन्स the whole universe is unreal and hence the relation between words and senses also is unreal. Yet, if from the phenomenal point of view (व्यावहारिकसत्ता) they accept the relative existence of words and their senses, they cannot negate the process of Suggestion. Moreover, as Suggestion is not an intellectual process, it cannot be identified with the logical process of inference (अनुमान), since no invariable concomitance (व्याप्ति) is found to exist between the suggestor (व्यञ्जक) and the suggested (व्यङ्ग्य), just as it is found between the middle term (हेतु) and the major term (साध्य). Nor can Suggestion be called a process of recollection (स्मृति), for, recollection is based upon the experiences of the

past. Memory cannot be awakened in the absence of past experiences. On the other hand, *Suggestion is a process of the direct, immediate and* unprecedented realization of the suggested sense which naturally culminates in the रसध्वनि (Suggestion of sentiments) Thus the existence and uniqueness *of ध्वनि cannot be denied in any way, since ध्वनि is* a fact belonging to the actual experience of the appreciators of poetic beauty (सहृदयs).

XVII. THE AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE

It has been formerly shown that अभिनवगुप्त holds the रसध्वनि (suggestion of sentiments) to be the most important of all the *varieties of ध्वनि*. He has here made an original and substantial contribution to the theory of poetry by harmonizing the doctrine of ध्वनि with the रस-doctrine of भरत It is भरत who first stressed the *emotional* aspect *of the* drama and treated of the psychological process of realizing रस. After him आनन्दवर्धन and particularly अभिनवगुप्त systematized and expounded in detail *those psychological facts* for the first time and applied them in a comprehensive manner to the theory of poetry. That भरत, आनन्दवर्धन and अभिनवगुप्त should employ psychology in the exposition of the *aesthetic experience derived* from literature is a fact which really redounds to the credit of their far-reaching insight, when it is

seen that the psychological treatment of literature is a tendency only recently developed in the West. It is, therefore, advisable to turn to the psychological process of realizing रस, which is held by अभिनवगुप्त to be *suggested* rather than expressed.

The theory of the aesthetic experience of रस in literature is briefly stated in the well-known aphorism of भरत, viz., ' विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद्रसनिष्पत्ति ' (The union of the Excitants, the Ensuants and the Accessory Emotions leads to the manifestation of रस),§ and on account of the ambiguity of the words 'संयोग' and 'निष्पत्ति' the सूत्र has given rise to various interpretations and theories propounded by भट्ट लोल्लट, श्रीशङ्कुक and भट्टनायक, the predecessors of अभिनवगुप्त.* भट्टलोल्लट, who is a मीमांसक, thinks that the correlation (संयोग) of the विभावs etc , with the रस is that of उत्पादक (cause) and उत्पाद्य (effect) He thus means ' उत्पत्ति ' by the word ' निष्पत्ति ' and puts forth the ' Production Theory' (उत्पत्तिवाद) of रस. श्रीशङ्कुक, a नैयायिक, holds that the relation between the विभावs etc , and the रस corresponds to the relation between the middle term (हेतु) and the major term (साध्य), in other words, the विभावs etc , are अनुमापक (the ground of inference) and the रस is अनुमाप्य (the thing to be inferred) He, therefore, means ' अनुमिति ' (infer-

§ भरत—नाट्यशास्त्रम्, अ ६, See Pages 140-144.

* See the अभिनवभारती अ ६, the ध्वन्यालोकलोचन, उद्योत १-२, and काव्यप्रकाश, उ. ४.

ential knowledge) by the word 'निष्पत्ति' and resorts to the theory of the Logical Inference of रस (अनुमितिवाद). This theory was in later times upheld by महिमभट्ट, who tried to demolish the 'Suggestion Theory' in his व्यक्तिविवेक.

These theories have been refuted by भट्टनायक, who for the first time gives a somewhat correct interpretation of भरत's सूत्र. He says that the relation between the विभाव and the रस is that of भोजक (cause of enjoyment) and भोज्य (the enjoyed); and thus signifying 'भुक्ति' by the word 'निष्पत्ति' he establishes the Theory of the Enjoyment of रस (भुक्तिवाद) on the basis of the सांख्य psychology and metaphysics. He thinks that रस is not produced; for, if it is supposed that करुण (the Pathetic) is really produced, no one would think of *enjoying* it. † Again, रस cannot be inferred, because inference is an intellectual process which cannot enhance a sentiment. For the exposition of the enjoyment of रस through the विभाव etc., भट्टनायक postulates *three functions of the poetic language* as distinguished from the language of prose and शास्त्र; and they are अभिधा, भावना (भावकत्व) and भोग (भोजकत्व). (a) अभिधा is, according to him, concerned with the expressed sense of a word and includes लक्षणा also. He means by this अभिधा the use of rhetorical language and

† उत्पत्तिपक्षे च करुणस्योत्पादाद् दुःखित्वे करुणप्रेक्षासु पुनरप्रवृत्तिः स्यात् । —ध्वन्यालोकलोचनम्, २

felicity of phrase, which are different from the अभिधा in शास्त्रs, where words are important. When the अभिधा is accepted, there is no need, he says, of postulating the function of व्यञ्जना as propounded by the ध्वनिवादिन्s. Recognizing the importance of रस he says that the essence of this रस is beyond verbal expression. Thus though he does not accept ध्वनि as the soul of poetry, yet in defiance of वस्तुध्वनि and अलङ्कारध्वनि he appears to give his partial sanction to रसध्वनि. According to his verse $ quoted by अभिनवगुप्त in his लोचन he seems to acknowledge ध्वनि (i. e. रसध्वनि) as a constituent (अंश) of poetry and not its essence (रूप). It, therefore, appears that he does not much differ from अभिनवगुप्त. (b) The second function postulated by him is भावना or भावकत्व, which is also called 'साधारणीकरण' or the function of generalization or universalization, by which the विभावs etc., depicted in poetry or drama lose their colour of particularity and are generalized or idealized in the minds of the readers of poetry or spectators of the drama by their power of imagination. This generalization made by the power of imagination must, of course, be distinguished from the generalization arrived at by the intellect from particular facts. It may properly be called 'idealization' or 'universalization'. The readers or spectators then lose their consciousness;

$ ध्वनिर्नामापरो योऽपि व्यापारो व्यञ्जनात्मकः ।
तस्य सिद्धेऽपि भेदे स्यात्काव्येंऽशत्वं न रूपता ।।—ध्वन्यालोकलोचनम्, १.

and their स्थायिभाव (*Sentiment*) also being idealized, they identify themselves with the poetic situation through their universalized sympathy According to भट्टनायक गुणs and अलङ्कारs in poetry help to bring about this idealization (साधारणीकरण), which, along with अभिधा inheres in poetry (c) At the third stage, when the स्थायिभाव aided by the विभावs etc, is idealized or generalized by means of अभिधा and भावकत्व, it reaches its climax and is enjoyed by the reader or spectator as pure bliss, enlightenment and repose owing to the excess of सत्वगुण. This enjoyment of रस is variously named as 'भोग, भोजकत्व, भोगीकरण' etc, and is different from inference (अनुमान), reminiscence (स्मृति) and perception (प्रत्यक्ष)

An important thing to be noted here is that भट्टनायक is the first Sanskrit critic who rightly stresses the subjective aspect of रस as *the aesthetic experience of the reader or spectator* rather than that of the poet, the characters and the actors, though sentiments exist in the latter also Again the threefold process of अभिधा, भावकत्व (साधारणीकरण) and भोग is in consonance with modern psychology, for, the understanding of the senses of words by means of अभिधा is the process of *cognition* which subserves the idealization of emotions by the power of 'साधारणीकरण', wherein imagination plays a prominent part The imagination of the reader bringing before his mental eye rich imagery heightens his sentiment, awakens universal sympathy and raises the sentiment to the state of aesthetic pleasure

अभिनवगुप्त has stated all these views of his predecessors and pointed out their flaws in his masterly and psychological exposition of the theory of रस contained in his commentaries on भरत's नाट्यशास्त्र and the ध्वन्यालोक. His main contention is that these views do not truly represent the intended meaning of the रससूत्र of भरत. He, therefore, bases his own interpretation only on भरत's actual words and trend of thought at different places in the नाट्यशास्त्र, and finds ample support for explaining the word 'निष्पत्ति' by the word 'अभिव्यक्ति' or 'अभिव्यञ्जन'. He further adds that the relation (संयोग) between the विभावs etc, and the रस is respectively that of व्यञ्जक (suggestor) and व्यङ्ग्य (the suggested). This is how he, with his penetrating insight, represents the true import of भरत and harmonizes it with the theory of ध्वनि or व्यञ्जना. Although he does not, on the whole, differ much from भट्टनायक, yet he criticizes him for rejecting व्यञ्जना and inventing the two functions of भावकत्व and भोग, which are not supported by the words of भरत and which must be included in the process of रसव्यञ्जना according to the import of भरत. He partially acknowledges the भावकत्व or साधारणीकरण of भट्टनायक; yet he shows the correspondence of भावकत्व with व्यञ्जकत्व (suggestiveness) and that of भोग with the व्यङ्ग्य (suggested sense) which is the same as रसप्रतीति or रसास्वाद (relish of रस). He, therefore, says that there is no testimony of भरत for inventing the two words 'भावकत्व' and 'भोग'.

He further points out that the विभाव etc., together with the proper employment of गुण and अलङ्कार in poetry, are themselves represented in a generic or idealized form. The भावकत्व or साधारणीकरण of भट्टनायक is, therefore, inherent in all of them,* nay, in all poetry. When the स्थायिभाव, which is also idealized, is united with the idealized विभाव etc , there is the manifestation (निष्पत्ति–अभिव्यक्ति) of रस. The विभाव etc , are expressed by the power of अभिधा, yet they become suggestors (व्यञ्जक) on account of their inherent suggestive power, while emotions, particularly the स्थायिभाव, cannot be expressed by अभिधा, but can only be suggested (व्यङ्ग्य) This is why there is no express mention of the स्थायिभाव in the रससूत्र of भरत. These स्थायिभाव, which are dormant in the form of instincts (वासना) in all beings, and which themselves are idealized (साधारणीकृत) in poetry, manifest रस in union with the विभाव etc It is not, therefore, advisable to postulate the separate power of भावकत्व which naturally exists in the poetic language and its sense possessing the power of suggestion It must, however, be remembered that though the rhetorical language generally possesses suggestiveness, yet Suggestion is something more than the rhetorical language, which properly comes within

---

* भावकत्वमपि समुचितगुणालङ्कारपरिग्रहात्मकम् ... तस्माद् व्यञ्जकत्वाख्येन व्यापारेण गुणालङ्कारौचित्यादिकयेतिकर्तव्यतया काव्य भावक रसान् भावयतीति त्र्यशायामपि भावनाया करणांशे ध्वननमेव निपतति ।

—ध्व. लोचनम्, २।४.

the domain of अभिधा Lastly, the भोग of भट्टनायक is the same as the realization of the suggested sense (व्यङ्ग्य) or the relish of रस, the source of which is the स्थायिभाव or the predominant passion of poetry that possesses suggestive power Thus both the भावकत्व and भोग of भट्टनायक come under the process of *Suggestion* and should not be taken to be independent processes $

It has been said above that the विभाव etc., are represented in poetry in an idealized form This means that the विभाव, अनुभाव and व्यभिचारिभाव are respectively not the causes, effects and accessories in the worldly (लौकिक) sense, but are the generalized or extraordinary (अलौकिक) causes, effects and accessories imagined for the purposes of poetry In the real world the stimuli or the worldly causes of awakening the instincts (वासना) are not always accompanied by a pleasurable emotional response In the idealized or transcendental (अलौकिक) world of poetry, however, the विभाव, अनुभाव and व्यभिचारिभाव being graphically depicted in union with the स्थायिभाव or the main theme invariably manifest रस or delight According to अभिनवगुप्त स्थायिभाव already exist in the minds of all beings in the form of latent impressions (संस्कार) or dispositions (वासना), which are held to be innate (नैसर्गिक) on account of their transmission

$ मतद्वयेऽस्य [भट्टनायकमतस्य] पूर्वस्मान्मतात् [अभिनवगुप्तमतात्] भावकत्वव्यापारान्तरस्वीकार एव विशेषः। भोगस्तु व्यक्तिः। भोगकृत्त्वं तु व्यञ्जनादविशिष्टम्। अन्यत्तु सर्वं समम्। —रसगङ्गाधर, १.

from the past birth to the present one, and may be called '*instincts*' *according to modern psychology* These instincts being trained or organized by experience in the present birth become चित्तवृत्तिs which may be termed '*sentiments*' † In human beings and particularly in the appreciators of literature (सहृदय) the sentiments are developed to a high degree of sensitiveness owing to the study of fine arts and the observation of the behaviour of others In the real world the सहृदयs get sufficient practice in inferring the moods of others from their behaviour on account of the invariable connection between the ordinary causes and effects or psycho logically, between stimulus and response This observation of the real world and the study of literature train their sentiments and imagination, and help them in appreciating similar situations in poetry and drama, in which the same sentiments (चित्तवृत्ति) depicted in a generalized form receive the name of स्थायिभावs As then the स्थायिभावs latently exist in all of us, there is no doubt that the रस exists in a potential state in the reader or the spectator on the one hand, and in the poet, his poetry or drama characters and actors on the other But the रस in the latter is called लौकिक (*ordinary*) *and that revealed in the hearts of the former is called*

† सर्वेषामनादिवासनाचित्रीकृतचेतसां वासनासंवादात्। जात एव हि जन्तुरियतीभिः संविद्भिः परीतो भवति। न ह्येतच्चित्तवृत्तिवासनाशून्यः प्राणी भवति। तस्मात् स्थायिरूपचित्तवृत्तिसूत्रस्यूता एवामी व्यभिचारिणः।

—अभिनवभारती, अ ६

अलौकिक (*extraordinary*), since it is *manifested in the appreciators alone*, through the union of the idealized विभाव etc, with the idealized स्थायिभाव of the appreciators Of course, the difference between the लौकिक रस and the अलौकिक रस is not the difference in kind but only in degree, and the अलौकिक रस is the sublimation of the लौकिक रस As then the रस in the appreciators (सहृदय) is अलौकिक (transcendental) in the sense that it is the sublimated form of ordinary emotions, the process of its realization is described in Sanskrit literary criticism particularly *from the viewpoint of appreciators* Thus the readers and spectators who are possessed of keen sensitiveness and *imagination* (विमलप्रतिभानशालि हृदया) are alone entitled to appreciate literature

It will, therefore, be instructive to observe how अभिनवगुप्त psychologically expounds in the अभिनवभारती the process of aesthetic experience in the appreciator's mind while the latter reads a poem or witnesses a drama He takes the examples of two verses from the कुमारसम्भव and one from the शाकुन्तल for elucidating this mental process Of the two verses from the कुमारसम्भव one beginning with 'हरस्तु किञ्चित्' has formerly been dealt with We shall now take the famous verse from the शाकुन्तल, viz, 'ग्रीवाभङ्गाभिरामं मुहुरनुपतति स्यन्दने बद्धदृष्टिः' etc, which अभिनवगुप्त has particularly selected for his psychological explanation from the viewpoint of the appreciator This verse contains a very graphic description of a deer, who, chased by दुष्यन्त, is running at a great

from the past birth to the present one, and may be called 'instincts' according to modern psychology These instincts being trained or organized by experience in the present birth become चित्तवृत्तिs which *may be termed 'sentiments'* † *In human beings* and particularly in the appreciators of literature (सहृदय) the sentiments are developed to a high degree of sensitiveness owing to the study of fine arts and the observation of the behaviour of others *In the real world the* सहृदयs *get sufficient practice* in inferring the moods of others from their behaviour on account of the invariable connection between the ordinary causes and effects or psychologically, between stimulus and response This observation of the real world and the study of literature train their sentiments and imagination, and help them in appreciating similar situations in poetry and drama, in which the same sentiments (चित्तवृत्ति) depicted in a generalized form receive the name of *स्थायिभाव*s As then the *स्थायिभाव*s latently exist in all of us, there is no doubt that the रस exists in a potential state in the reader or the spectator on the one hand, and in the poet, his poetry or drama characters and actors on the other But the रस in the latter is called लौकिक *(ordinary) and that revealed in the hearts of the former is called*

---

† सर्वेषामनादिवासनाचित्रीकृतचेतसां वासनासंवादात् । जात एव हि जन्तुरियतीभि संविद्भि परीतो भवति । . न ह्येतच्चित्तवृत्तिवासनाशून्य प्राणी भवति । तस्मात्स्थायिरूपचित्तवृत्तिसूत्रस्यूता एवामी व्यभिचारिण ।

—अभिनवभारती, अ ६

अलौकिक (*extraordinary*), since it is *manifested in the appreciators alone*, through the union of the idealized विभावs etc., with the idealized स्थायिभाव of the appreciators. Of course, the difference between the लौकिक रस and the अलौकिक रस is not the difference in kind but only in degree; and the अलौकिक रस is the sublimation of the लौकिक रस. As then the रस in the appreciators (सहृदय) is अलौकिक (transcendental) in the sense that it is the sublimated form of ordinary emotions, the process of its realization is described in Sanskrit literary criticism particularly *from the viewpoint of appreciators*. Thus the readers and spectators who are possessed of keen sensitiveness and *imagination* (विमलप्रतिभानशालिहृदयाः) are alone entitled to appreciate literature.

It will, therefore, be instructive to observe how अभिनवगुप्त psychologically expounds in the अभिनवभारती the process of aesthetic experience in the appreciator's mind while the latter reads a poem or witnesses a drama. He takes the examples of two verses from the कुमारसम्भव and one from the शाकुन्तल for elucidating this mental process. Of the two verses from the कुमारसम्भव one beginning with 'हरस्तु किंचित्' has formerly been dealt with. We shall now take the famous verse from the शाकुन्तल, viz., 'ग्रीवाभङ्गाभिरामं मुहुरनुपतति स्यन्दने बद्धदृष्टिः' etc., which अभिनवगुप्त has particularly selected for his psychological explanation from the viewpoint of the appreciator. This verse contains a very graphic description of a deer, who, chased by दुष्यन्त, is running at a great

speed through fear. When we begin to read this verse or witness the scene in the drama, we first *cognize the meaning of sentences in it* At the *first stage*, therefore, the *cognition of meaning*, which is an intellectual process, takes place, when we follow the sequence of individual words and sentences through the functions of अभिधा and तात्पर्य. But at the *second stage*, after the meaning of the whole verse has been understood, there stands vividly before us a mental image of the scene in which the sequence of individual sentences totally disappears and cognition gives place to the *free play of our imagination*, which is automatically at *work owing to the idealized representation*, in the verse, of the विभावs in union with the स्थायिभाव of fear.* The frightened deer that stands before the eye of our *imagination is thus divested of all* particularity and appears in an idealized form, on account of the *power of generalization* inherent in words and ideas At the *third stage* the स्थायिभाव of fear corresponding to the fear of the deer is awakened in our hearts The actual deer being now idealized is *deprived of the limits of time and place*, and the individual consciousness, viz , 'I am afraid , ' He is

* अधिकारी चात्र विमलप्रतिभानशालिहृदय । तस्य च 'ग्रीवाभङ्गाभि०' इति 'हरस्तु किञ्चित्' इत्यादिवाक्येभ्यो वाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तेरनन्तर मानसी साक्षात्कारात्मिकाऽपहस्तिततत्तद्वाक्योपात्तकालादिविभागा तावत् प्रतीतिरुपजायते । तस्या च यो मृगपोतकादिर्भाति तस्य विशेषरूपत्वाभावाद्भीत इति त्रासकस्यापारमार्थिकत्वाद्भयमेव पर देशकालाद्यनालिङ्गितम् । —अभिनवभारती, अ. ६.

afraid,' 'The enemy is afraid,' 'The friend is afraid,' or 'A third person is afraid' is completely lost here. Thus at the *third stage* the sentiment of fear being realized in the *absence of any barriers of the external world* and heightened by our imagination is directly experienced by us as the pleasurable भयानक रस. This happens in the case of every appreciator who reads that verse This *universalization* (साधारण्य) of sentiments is, therefore, not limited to place, time or an individual, but transcends all these barriers. This is the identification of our soul with the poetic situation experienced *by ourselves through the power of imagination*, after the obstacle of the sense of individuality and the physical world is removed In the case of the audience witnessing the drama this idealized स्थायिभाव of fear develops into the sentiment of the group or community (समष्टि), as the instincts (वासना) handed down from time immemorial are common to all At this time the self-illuminant soul, which is of the nature of pure consciousness (चित्-संविद्) and bliss (आनन्द) and which illuminates all their mental states, reveals itself in the form of delightful surprise (चमत्कार) which exhibits tremor and horripilation on the body जगन्नाथ says that this is the *suggestion* or manifestation of the pure consciousness of the soul, the veil of ignorance (अविद्या) on which has passed away, and that the विभावादि in union with the स्थायिभाव presenting themselves *as mental images* are illuminated by the Eternal Seer (साक्षी), just as objects seen

in a dream and silver appearing on tin owing to optic illusion in wakefulness are illuminated by the Eternal Seer in the प्रातिभासिक (illusory) state, according to the वेदान्त philosophy § Though this transcendental relish (चर्वणा, आस्वाद) is akin to the relish of ब्रह्मन्, it is not the absolute state of परमात्मन् This ineffable 'रस' is, therefore, the suggested sense (व्यङ्ग्य), the suggestors (व्यञ्जक) of which are the idealized विभावs etc Here, it is the स्थायिभाव alone that is fit to be relished, yet the स्थायिभाव itself is not रस Nor can the विभावs etc, be individually called रस, just as the ingredients of a beverage cannot be called a beverage As long as the स्थायिभाव comes into contact with the विभावs and others, the union of all manifests itself as a *synthetic inward experience* or the relish of रस, which vanishes when that union is disturbed As, however, the separateness of the स्थायिभाव and the विभावs is not felt in the realization of रस, the latter (रस) is free from the *limitations of* the former It is only for the relish of this रस or a short liberation from the bonds of the physical world that the सहृदयs read and enjoy poetry again and again It cannot be said that a poem once enjoyed is not enjoyable again and is to be thrown away It is repeatedly read not because words in

§ व्यक्तिश्च भग्नावरणा चित्। प्रकाशयति स्वय च प्रकाशते आत्म चैतन्य विभावादिसवलितान् रत्यादीन्। अन्त करणधर्माणां साक्षिभास्य त्वाभ्युपगते। विभावादीनामपि स्वप्नतुरगादीनामिव रङ्गरजतादीनामिव साक्षिभास्यत्वमविरुद्धम्। —रसगङ्गाधर, १.

it convey only an expressed sense which once known need not be known again, but because poetic words are capable of yielding a suggested sense which is ever new to the appreciator. This suggested sense is the रसध्वनि, the stages in the realization of which are imperceptible (अलक्ष्यक्रम). †

अभिनवगुप्त, however, broadly marks, as detailed above, *three psychological stages* in the realization of the रस in a poem by the reader. The *first stage* involves the cognition of the formal or intellectual elements of the poem, and serves as a means to the second. The *second stage* consists of the idealization of things in poetry or drama by the power of Imagination in the reader or spectator. The *third stage* can be marked as the climax of the inexpressible affective (emotional) condition of the reader or spectator. When thus the formal or intellectual, imaginative and emotional elements of a poem blended into one predominant sentiment and making a simultaneous appeal awaken the स्थायिभाव of the reader or spectator, the relish of रस is manifested as *a unity* in his heart, leaving no trace of the constituent elements; and this is why the रसध्वनि is called 'असंलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्य' or the suggested sense without imperceptible stages.

† दृश्यते हि तदेव काव्यं पुनः पुनः पठंश्चर्व्यमाणश्च सहृदयो लोकः। न तु काव्यस्य तत्र 'उपादायापि ये हेयाः' इति न्यायेन कृतप्रतीतिकस्यानुपयोग एवेति शब्दस्यापीह ध्वननव्यापारः। अत एवाऽलक्ष्यक्रमता।

—ध्वन्यालोकलोचनम्, २।१

It may be noted here that Dr. I. A. Richards recognizes in his 'Principles of Literary Criticism' (Chapter XVI) the following *six* stages of the aesthetic experience derived from a poem: (I) The visual sensations of the printed words, (II) Tied imagery or images very closely associated with these sensations, (III) Free imagery or images relatively free; (IV) References to, or 'thinkings of', various things, (V) Emotions, (VI) Affective-volitional attitudes. The Stages I and II can be broadly included in the *first stage* referred to by अभिनवगुप्त, stages III and IV in his *second stage*, and stages V and VI in his *third stage*. This comparison will show that the stages marked by अभिनवगुप्त agree in general with those stated by Dr. Richards, though the details given by the latter are not mentioned by the former. Yet it will be found that the details of Dr. Richards are implied in the three stages referred to by अभिनवगुप्त. It is essential, however, to remember here the difference between the संलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्यध्वनि and the असंलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्यध्वनि. While ascertaining the exact number of stages the following sentences of Dr. Richards should be particularly noted: "The facts upon which speculations as to the relations between thoughts and the things which they are 'of' have been based, have as a rule been taken from introspection. But the facts which introspection yields are notoriously uncertain, and the special position of the observer may well preclude success. Introspection is competent, in some cases, to discover the

relations between events which take place within the mind, but cannot by itself give information as to the relations of these events with the external world (p. 126) ... ... It is difficult to represent diagrammatically what takes place in thought in any satisfactory fashion (p. 131)." † Under such circumstances it is immaterial whether the number of stages is three or six. On the whole, the mental process of aesthetic experience described by अभिनवगुप्त is generally in agreement with the Western Psychology.

It may also be said that the same process goes on in the mind of the poet while composing a poem, since he is possessed of the same mental outfit, though the affective, cognitive, conative and imaginative elements unified in a synthetic whole are at work in him in a higher degree than in the reader. It is worthy of note what Coleridge says in his enlightened exposition of the poet's mind. It is as follows—

"The poet, described in ideal perfection, brings the whole soul of man into activity, with the subordination of its faculties to each other according to their relative worth and dignity. He diffuses a tone and spirit of unity, that blends, and (as it were) *fuses*, each into each, by that synthetic and magical power, to which I would exclusively appropriate the name of Imagination. This power, first put in action by the will and understanding, and retained under their irremissive, though gentle

† Principles of Literary Criticism, Chapter XVI.

and *unnoticed, control, reveals itself* in the balance or reconcilement of opposite or discordant qualities of sameness with difference, of the general with the concrete, the idea with the image, *the individual with the representative, the sense of* novelty and freshness with old and familiar objects; a more than usual state of emotion with more than usual order, judgment ever awake and steady self-*possession with enthusiasm and feeling profound or* vehement, and while it blends and harmonizes the natural and the artificial, still subordinates art to nature, the manner to the matter and our admiration of the poet to our sympathy with the poetry. Finally, Good Sense is the body of poetic genius, Fancy its Drapery, Motion its Life, and Imagination *the Soul that is everywhere and in each and forms* all into one graceful and intelligent whole "

—Biographia Literaria, Chapter XIV

It is worth remembering that the mental process up to the limit of the actual realization of रस can be described in psychological terms, and the same has been done by अभिनवगुप्त from whom the Western critics and psychologists do not seem to differ But even the modern psychology is unable to expound the actual relish of रस as experienced by the reader or the poet, and cannot proceed beyond using merely the words 'Aesthetic Pleasure' or 'Poetic *Attitude' to indicate it. The fact is that the very* moment we begin to think, 'What is this relish?' or 'I am enjoying that relish', the रस vanishes. This awareness is really an impediment in the realization

of रस, where the Knower and the Known become one We may entertain the above thoughts *before* and *after* that ineffable state, but they can never be *directly* indicative of the experience of रस. The reason why psychology is inadequate to expound the actual relish of रस is that it has limited its own scope particularly to the conscious states (Affection, Cognition and Conation) of the mind, and even if it has recently begun to seek the aid of the 'Unconscious' for the explanation of the conscious behaviour, yet it cannot explain the definite nature and limits of the 'Unconscious' Moreover, Western literary critics like I A Richards have lately begun to apply psychology to Literature and Literary Criticism Under such circumstances it would be unwise to seek the exclusive aid of psychology for explaining aesthetic experiences If poetry aspires to transcend the physical as well as the mental planes, how can it rest solely on psychology for the elucidation of *all* the facts of its experience? Shelley says, "A poet participates in the eternal, the infinite and the one, as far as relates to his conceptions, time and place and number are not"—(A Defence of Poetry) Is it not then natural for poets and literary critics to rely on philosophy in matters where psychology fails? Is not Coleridge's brilliant exposition of the 'Creative Imagination' in his 'Biographia Literaria' based on philosophy? Does he not again harmonize poetry with philosophy by saying "No man was ever yet a great poet, without being at the same time a pro-

found philosopher"? अभिनवगुप्त, after fully supplying *the psychological exposition of the inward aesthetic* experience of the reader, depends upon philosophy in the last resort, and all later critics up to जगन्नाथ have followed him in this respect. Particularly जगन्नाथ has clarified अभिनवगुप्त's doctrine, by adding *that this aesthetic experience is 'भग्नावरणा चित्' [pure consciousness free from the veil of ignorance]* or that it is साक्षिभास्य [illuminated by the Eternal Seer]. When this is a perfectly scientific explanation and the last word on the actual aesthetic experience, it is nothing less than short-sightedness to reject it. *Why, the noted authors of Sanskrit Poetics not only* avail themselves of the वेदान्त philosophy, but also of the शास्त्रs like व्याकरण, मीमांसा, न्याय and साङ्ख्य, as we have formerly dealt with in detail Branches of human knowledge are always correlated, and it is only *for the convenience of treatment that we specify* them as different sciences If these facts are taken into account, it appears unjust to blame the Sanskrit critics for giving a philosophical aspect to their exposition of the poetic (aesthetic) experience, when it is quite evident that even the Western poets and critics have done the same Of course, in addition to the above शास्त्रs, the modern psychology ought to be applied to literature and literary criticism as a valuable aid. Its limitations, however, should never be lost sight of, just as the limitations of the above शास्त्रs have never been ignored by the ancient Sanskrit critics

---

XVIII. CONCLUSION.

In this general survey of the Hindu Methodology we have found that the methods of teaching handed down by *oral* tradition for several generations and followed by the Shastris up to this time are corroborated by the mutually acknowledged lingustic theories of the Hindu schools of thought and by the actual records of those methods of explanation in the commentary literature in Sanskrit. We have, therefore, traced this Methodology in the oral tradition of the Shastris as well as in the vast range of Sanskrit literature, so as to preserve the best parts of it for future use in study and teaching. Further, while entering into the details we have discovered that the chief characteristics of this General Methodology are the distinctness and unity of purpose, the Causal Relation of things, the means of proof (प्रमाण), the enumeration, classification and definition of categories or topics of discussion, and the organization of subordinate and principal elements or parts and the whole of a subject. These features have been found by comparison to be common to the Eastern as well as Western Methodology, which has, therefore, been prominently *analytico-synthetic* (अन्वयव्यतिरेकात्मक). It will, therefore, be frequently noticed that all the preceding sections dealing with the methods of various शास्त्र (न्याय, व्याकरण, मीमांसा, वेदान्त, साहित्य, etc.) and with the mental process of verbal comprehension (शाब्दबोध described by them are, as it were, unified with

common bond of this analytico-synthetic aspect or अन्वयव्यतिरेक into an organized whole.

We have then shown that both the Eastern Logic and the Western Logic have largely contributed to the development of the General Methodology, though the comparison of the Eastern and Western psychology has disclosed to us the fact that psychology has played no small part in that development. We have then seen that the Eastern psychology compares favourably with the Western psychology, has conduced to the development of the principles of education according to the Oriental outlook, and has contributed much to the theory of 'literary criticism' and the appreciation of literature by propounding the theory of रस as in भरत's नाट्यशास्त्र. In this context we have also suggested that some of भरत's tenets of dramaturgy can be applied with advantage to the science of teaching.

In the comparison of the Eastern and Western Logic we have discovered that Induction is not the privileged province of the Western Logic alone, but that it corresponds to the व्याप्तिग्रहोपाय (the process of arriving at the invariable concomitance) and is implied in the 'deductive-inductive' syllogism as propounded by the Indian Logic (न्याय). Then after showing that corresponding to the general methodology some common methodical forms of literature have come into existence in Sanskrit, we have turned to the methods of the व्याकरण, मीमांसा and वेदान्त, which exemplify the common characteristics of the general methodology. Those methods have, as we

have demonstrated, been developed according to the nature (Nominal Style) of the Sanskrit language and the divergent theories upheld by each system of thought Again, we have been able to disclose that even though those methods are ancient, they bear a striking resemblance to the psychological methods of studying and teaching language as recently developed and recognized by all in the West. In India too Logic is particularly found to have helped the methodical development of the linguistic principles of पद्, वाक्य and प्रमाण, which are not sectarian or limited to the शास्त्र that propound them, but have been accepted as *the general principles of the method of interpretation* even by the शास्त्र like the वेदान्त, साहित्य, etc, which have again derived for their own exposition much assistance from the Eastern psychology Particularly the वेदान्त and the साहित्य have harmonized the *logical* principles of पद् (व्याकरण), वाक्य (मीमांसा) and प्रमाण (न्याय) as well as the *psychological* principles of the Upanishads, the सांख्य-system and the dramaturgy of भरत into a synthetic whole Both these are, therefore, the शास्त्र prominently advocating the *Synthetic Method* of study. Since the न्याय, as a general science (सर्वशास्त्रोपकारक) with its deductive-inductive aspect, has influenced all other शास्त्र, it has been shown to conduce to the development of the *critical or scientific methods* of study Again, the combination of पद्, वाक्य and प्रमाण has itself made for the correlation of studies and testifies to the existence of the *Comparative*

Method in ancient India, though the modern *Historical Method* does not seem to have existed in ancient times.

Almost all the शास्त्रs recognize the four प्रमाणs of the नैयायिकs, viz., प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान, उपमान and शब्द, of which the शब्दप्रमाण (verbal testimony) is emphasized more than others in the *General Science of Interpretation*, formulated by the mutual help of the theories of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण. The common linguistic principles included under the wider शब्दप्रमाण have not only been *theoretically* dealt with in detail by the Indian systems of thought, but have been *practically* employed in the *oral* explanations (teaching) and *written* explanations (commentaries) of *intellectual and emotional subjects* (*i. e.* शास्त्र and काव्य). The practical application of the interpretative methods of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण is evidenced by the Sanskrit commentaries following the methods of दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय, the various characteristics of which have been revealed by us in the light of the modern principles of language-teaching, so that the ancient method of खण्डान्वय in its modified form should find general acceptance in schools and colleges as the reformed method of teaching Sanskrit.

As the खण्डान्वयपद्धति is distinctly analytico-synthetic in character, culminating naturally in the 'telling of the purport' (तात्पर्यकथन), the preliminary linguistic principles that fall under the शब्दप्रमाण and lead us to the 'तात्पर्यवृत्ति' have been

presented in detail, discovering at each step their philosophical, psychological and educational implications in comparison with the Western psychology, principles of language-study and their educational bearings It is with this particular end in view that the linguistic theories (Sections XI-XVI) of the वैयाकरणs, वेदान्तिन्s, मीमांसकs (अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s and अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s), नैयायिकs and आलङ्कारिकs have been set forth after organizing and bringing out in relief their scattered psychological thoughts about the process of verbal comprehension (शाब्दबोध) and omitting their hair-splitting distinctions unnecessary for the purpose in hand Various views of the Hindu schools of thought about the 'अभिधा' (Expression) and 'the import of words' have then been detailed and compared with similar ones as explained by the Western psychology, so as to accentuate their importance in language-teaching In all this treatment sufficient attention has been paid to the difference to be observed while teaching Sanskrit to the students of elementary, intermediate and advanced stages The principles of अभिधा and verbal comprehension being based on the mental process of *analysis* and *synthesis* lead us ultimately to the principles of तात्पर्यवृत्ति (Purport) which is predominantly concerned with the *synthesis* of the individual *meaning* of words Hence the psychological process involved in this synthesis according to the Hindu schools of thought has been expounded after harmonizing the divergent viws. It has also been pointed out that all these '

principles including the तात्पर्यवृत्ति are as much useful in understanding the unified sense of the *prose* material studied at the school stage as in determining the purport of the highly *intellectual subjects* dealt with in शास्त्रs and studied at the higher stage; *and they can be employed as much in the teaching* of language and literature at both the stages as in the *self-study* of the same

The understanding of the *purport* depends much on the uninterrupted comprehension of the unified sense of words, which convey either an express (वाच्य) or implied (लक्ष्य) meaning After the treatment of अभिधा and तात्पर्य, therefore, we have dealt with लक्षणा, which arises from the incompatibility of ascertaining the purport (तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति) That all Hindu schools of thought except that of the आलङ्कारिकs recognize only the *two functions* of अभिधा and लक्षणा, is the indication of the fact that the knowledge of both of them is indispensable to the study and teaching of the inner meaning of prose works and शास्त्रs But as लक्षणा has also been accepted by the आलङ्कारिकs, *we come to know that लक्षणा involves even* a subtler aspect of 'fancy' and emotion. It naturally leads us to use some figures of speech and partly culminates in व्यञ्जना, which is prominently an emotional process, and which has been recognized only by the आलङ्कारिकs as the *third function* The knowledge of लक्षणा and of the mental process behind its employment is as much necessary for the *appreciation* of the inner aspects of *poetry* as

for the *understanding* of intellectual subjects and शास्त्र. These intellectual and emotional aspects of काव्य have, therefore, been purposely set forth, since the knowledge of both is very useful in the *study and teaching* of literature and शास्त्र. Further, the special function of व्यञ्जना (ध्वनि) and the realization of रस have been treated of in detail, with examples, in the light of the Western psychology and Eastern philosophy, after taking into account the fact that their knowledge is indispensable to the *synthetic* study and teaching of poetry. We have shown that though both the functions of तात्पर्य and व्यञ्जना result in the *synthesis* of meaning, they differ widely in their effects on the readers' or students' minds. The effect of the former is *intellectual*, while that of the latter is manifestly *emotional*, since the latter develops into रस. The detailed treatment of ध्वनि and रस is, therefore, calculated to contribute to the successful teaching of poetry as well as to the *synthetic criticism* of Sanskrit literature. We have attempted in this context to describe, as far as possible, the psychological process of the realization of रस or the aesthetic experience by comparing the views of the Eastern and Western critics. It has then been suggested that 'synthetic literary criticism' in Sanskrit would assume a definite form, if the theories of रस and ध्वनि with their originally synthetic character would be supported by psychology as well as philosophy, Eastern and Western.

These aesthetic principles of literary criticism, which are particularly useful at the advanced stage

of studying Sanskrit literature, are also calculated to enlighten the teachers of Sanskrit on the emotional approach to be made by them while teaching the appreciation of poetry In other words, the teachers of Sanskrit, being equipped with the knowledge of तात्पर्य, लक्षणा, व्यञ्जना and रस, should be keenly alive to the implied (लक्ष्य) and suggested (व्यङ्ग्य) senses of words in sentences or passages, should either *tell them to students* or explain *them through questions* as framed according to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, and should always aim at the *synthetic* teaching of literature and the enhancement of रस Much, of course, depends on the general appreciative attitude, keen sensitiveness and liveliness, which are inborn in some teachers, but which can be developed *to some extent in others by the deep, continuous* and varied reading of Sanskrit literature in the light of Poetics It is with this practical aim that लक्षणा, व्यञ्जना and रस have been particularly dis cussed along with their psychological bearings, which have been newly revealed here.

Now the *theories of* अन्विताभिधान *and* अभिहितान्वय previous to the above topics will show teachers how Sanskrit should be taught at the initial and advanced stages respectively, those of the relation of 'Thought and Language' and of अभिधा will elucidate how the 'direct bond' between a word and an idea can be established according to the Hindu outlook, and how words should be taught, and those of तात्पर्य will be helpful in the teaching of the *synthetic* meaning of literary passages One

thing must be borne in mind that the principles of अभिधा and तात्पर्य will facilitate only the *understanding* of literature, while those of लक्षणा partially, and those of व्यञ्जना and रस wholly, will help the *appreciation* of the same. Thus we have not only detailed the methods of teaching Sanskrit at the initial stage, but also those of teaching the शास्त्र and literature at the higher stage, so as to maintain the continuity of the psychological method of खण्डान्वय at all the stages.

It is worth remembering that the commonly recognized linguistic principles of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण as formulated by the वैयाकरण, मीमांसक and नैयायिक respectively have been accepted and synthesized by the वेदान्तिन् for the interpretation of the Upanishadic philosophy, and also by the आलङ्कारिक for the *practical* purpose of the appreciation of poetry. With the same practical end in view the आलङ्कारिक have not only availed themselves of the theories of the above schools of thought regarding अभिधा and लक्षणा, but after harmonizing them they have made original contributions to the linguistic science in general and to the Poetics in particular by expounding the theory of रस and ध्वनि in the light of the साङ्ख्य and वेदान्त systems. Again, it is noteworthy that side by side with the exposition of the *theory* of poetry the आलङ्कारिक have also dealt with the *practice* of poetry by writing works on the *training of poets*, in whose pursuit of composing poetry they desire to offer aid by means of the *practical*

hints embodied in their own works, though it is doubtful whether a poet can be *made* in this way. Among such works on the *training of poets* (कविशिक्षा) we find the औचित्यविचारचर्चा and कविकण्ठाभरण of क्षेमेन्द्र, the काव्यकल्पलतावृत्ति of अरिसिंह and अमरचन्द्र, the कविकल्पलता of देवेश्वर and the काव्यमीमांसा of राजशेखर.

When all these attempts have been made by our worthy ancestors in Sanskrit literature, it is not unnatural for us to proceed a step further and extend the practical applications of all the above theories to the science of teaching, by suggesting reforms in Sanskrit teaching on the fundamental basis of the Hindu Methodology in its combination with the Western Methodology It is with this practical purpose in view that by mainly adopting the Comparative Method and the psychological approach we have so far traced the principles of the Hindu Methodology, which is fraught with educational implications The aim of all this comparative and psychological approach is manifestly to supply a sound *theoretical* and *practical* basis for the study and teaching of Sanskrit from beginning to end We have here attempted to supply this *basis* after taking into account the *nominal* (सुबन्तप्रधान) character of the Sanskrit language It is now high time to bring this Hindu Methodology into practice for the purpose of the *intensive* and *extensive* study and teaching of the Sanskrit language and literature, when we see similar attempts being made in the West to base language-teaching on psychology and linguistics

There is no doubt that the above principles of अभिधा, तात्पर्य, लक्षणा and व्यञ्जना are already known by the Shastris *and that they are studied* by higher students of Sanskrit in Arts Colleges. Now in the case of the Shastris it may be said that though they possess in general a comparative outlook with regard to the Hindu शास्त्रs like the व्याकरण, मीमांसा, न्याय and others, many of them being unacquainted with English are not in a position to *compare* their own principles with similar Western principles and realize the value of their own ones, while though the Sanskrit students in Arts Colleges or graduates of the University study *in outline* the above linguistic principles in works like the काव्यप्रकाश, they do not seem to have realized their psychological and educational implications, *since many of them study and* teach them only for the sake of examinations, and do not know the Western psychology and principles of language-study so as to adopt a comparative view of the Eastern and Western principles. Even though some people possess the knowledge of the Western psychology and science of teaching, yet on account of general apathy towards Sanskrit, they have not cared to study Sanskrit with interest and assiduity and to see whether the Eastern principles can be compared with the Western ones. It is due to this general apathy that even the lovers of Sanskrit have perhaps been carried away by the general impression that Sanskrit literature contains scanty material as *regards methodology and methods of* teaching. Nor have they found it worth while

investigate into the *details* of the oral traditions of the *Shastris. This is why the lovers of Sanskrit have* tried, with good intentions of course, to introduce reforms with favourable results in Sanskrit teaching on the lines laid down by the Western authorities *for the reformed teaching of classical languages* like Greek and Latin. There is, of course, no harm in adopting foreign methods (e. g. the Conversational or Direct Method) if they are beneficial particularly to *pupils,* but it is certainly better to draw upon the natural resources of our own soil, to amalgamate them with good things in the West for the purpose of achieving better results, than *to resort exclusively* to the foreign things. Although the public in general is sceptical about the efficacy of those *Western methods,* we aver, on the *basis* of the Hindu Methodology detailed so far and of our own experience, that some of those methods, *with modifications suited to the nature of the* Sanskrit language and our culture, are calculated to prove beneficial. We shall, of course, support the *modern methods of teaching Sanskrit in many* respects by suggesting a similar procedure to be adopted by teachers in their lessons in the class; yet the main unattempted work that we have done so far is that of supplying a sound theoretical basis for that practical procedure from the Oriental point of view. We have, therefore, attempted so far to trace similar *methods in the oral traditions of the* Shastris as well as in the actual records of them (e. g. खण्डान्वय) in the commentary literature in Sanskrit. Moreover, we have supplied the theoretical

and psychological background of these methods as found in the common linguistic theories of the various Hindu schools of thought.

Our comparison of the Eastern Methodology with the Western one will, doubtless, prove that the former is in no way inferior to the latter, but is more fundamental and subtle from the philosophical and psychological points of view. Again, it will be repeatedly noticed that the Hindu schools of thought too have their own psychological ideas, on the basis of which they propound their linguistic theories and try to explain the process of verbal comprehension. We have, therefore, not solely depended upon a particular Sanskrit work in the task of our comparison, but have assiduously searched for such linguistic psychology in the Sanskrit works of different schools of thought by selecting similar topics in all, by noting similarity or contrast in their treatment, and at last by comparing those topics with the Western thoughts corresponding to them. Much matter, therefore, that is not given in the usual text-books will be found to have been revealed by us from a new point of view. The general manner of treatment of the Eastern principles of language and poetry as adopted here is first to reproduce them with examples in close conformity with the different Hindu schools of thought and then to reveal, along with our own thoughts, their psychological and educational implications in the light of the psychology, principles of language-study and theories

poetry in the West It will thus be noticed that though the same old principles of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण or अभिधा, लक्षणा and व्यञ्जना have been reproduced by us, yet they have been looked at from a new (comparative) and practical point of view. Of course, no small amount of mental effort is required for a thorough grasp of those abstruse Eastern principles and also for their organized reproduction with the view of preserving the rich thoughts of the past for future use and facilitating the understanding of novices Yet a more distinctive feature than their reproduction would perhaps be their persistent study, concentrated reflection and mental organization with a definite purpose, i e, with the comparative, psychological and educational outlook, and also their presentation from the same standpoint, so as to obtain fruitful results in Sanskrit teaching It is for the worthy judges to decide how far we have succeeded in this attempt.

READING AND RECITATION

Sanskrit literature evinces tendencies towards minute analysis of facts and logical organization of thoughts These characteristics of methodology are distinctly observable in all the branches of knowledge to which Hindus have substantially contributed The development of the different Shastras was chiefly due to this methodology, for, the word 'Shastra' signifies nothing less than systematization of knowledge Although the Shastras are logical in their treatment, we need not suppose that the province of psychology altogether escaped the attention of Hindus Many works in Sanskrit literature bear testimony to scattered thoughts on psychology, which, however, were not unified into a separate science in the modern sense of the term. The psychology of the group also received due attention in the science of dramaturgy, which had highly developed and specially treated of the practical principles and ways of heightening the interest of the audience The attitude of apathy towards Sanskrit language and literature is responsible for the general impression that Hindus had little to contribute to methodology and methods of teaching The study of original Sanskrit works, however, sometimes reveals to us illuminating ideas on methods of teaching Practical psychology has found enough scope in the treatment of emotions and sentiments in dramaturgy.

The science of phonetics developed in the प्रातिशाख्य and शिक्षा to such an extent in Sanskrit that it has been instrumental in preserving the *pristine purity of that language up to the present* day. If correct pronunciation is not properly attended to in the teaching of Sanskrit, it is not Sanskrit that is taught but a corrupt form of language like प्राकृत, *which owed their rise to corrupt pronunciation*. The importance of correct pronunciation and good reading was much stressed by Sanskrit writers on phonetics, and valuable suggestions on expressive reading and recitation were made in detail in the पाणिनीयशिक्षा, the नाट्यशास्त्र of भरत and the काव्यमीमांसा of राजशेखर. They compare favourably with similar suggestions in English books on phonetics, and are as helpful to teachers of languages as to actors on the stage. It must, however, be remembered that though dramatic aptitude is a great asset to a *teacher, it is needless for him to aspire after as much* proficiency in histrionics as is demanded of actors on the stage. पतञ्जलि in his व्याकरणमहाभाष्य clearly distinguishes between ग्रन्थिक or reciters who represented the *feelings by words alone and* शौभनिक (शोभिक) who were teachers of actors and managers of the stage. Teachers are here to assume the role of ग्रन्थिक, not of शौभनिक, and conduct their reading and recitation in an *expressive manner.*. *It is here* proposed to put, together those stray suggestions in an organized form for the use of teachers.

The 'पाणिनीयशिक्षा *after dealing with the internal* and external effort required for producing sounds

locates the letters of all classes in the mouth and shows how they are to be correctly articulated. According to the नाट्यशास्त्र, the matter to be read or recited consists of words which are divided into several parts, as vowels, consonants, Sandhis or euphonic combinations, case-terminations, nouns, verbs, prepositions, indeclinables, compounds, and nominal as well as verbal derivatives. Gestures performed in combination with these words in sentences are called वाचिकाभिनय.

Now, the characteristics of good reading and recitation, according to भरत, are seven musical notes, three places or organs of utterance, four accents, two varieties of intonation, six embellishments and six auxiliaries.

I. Notes-The seven musical notes are षड्ज, ऋषभ, गान्धार, मध्यम, पञ्चम, धैवत and निषाद, which are used as basic sounds to express different sentiments. For instance, मध्यम and पञ्चम are employed as basic notes to express humour and erotic sentiment (हास्य and शृङ्गार), षड्ज and ऋषभ to represent the sentiments of heroism, wrath and surprise (वीर, रौद्र and अद्भुत), गान्धार and निषाद to reveal pathos (करुण), and धैवत to show terror and repulsion (भयानक and बीभत्स).

II. Places-The three places or organs of utterance are the chest or lungs, the throat or glottis and the head or palate in which originate the low (मन्द्र), middle, (मध्य) and high (तार) pitches while modulating the voice. When a person is at a dis-

tance, we speak with him in a high pitch, when he is not far off, we speak in a middle pitch, and when he is very near, we speak in a low pitch In ordinary speech we make use of the middle pitch, but in reading and recitation, a sentence should generally start in a low pitch *from the chest, should* rise to a high pitch towards the palate or head and should stop at the middle pitch in the throat In reading poetry possessed of प्रसाद, the voice should be brought to a low pitch, in reading poetry containing ओजस्, the voice should be raised *to a high pitch and the poetry of a general type should* be read with lower and higher pitches in succession

III Accents-The four accents are उदात्त, अनुदात्त, स्वरित and कम्पित As their use prevails particularly in the Vedic Sanskrit, their consideration is of little concern to those who are more interested in Classical Sanskrit

IV Intonation-राजशेखर, who in his काव्यमीमांसा has dealt with intonation in detail, says that intonation or काकु is a quality of expressive reading and that it serves to bring out the proper sense of a *literary passage* The *reader should make use* of intonation in his reading with due attention to the three styles of composition, viz, the वैदर्भी which is lucid and perspicuous, the गौड़ी which is full of lengthy compounds, and the पाञ्चाली which is mid-way between the two There are two main varieties of intonation, viz., साकाङ्क्ष and निराकाङ्क्ष. The intonation which expresses expectancy

on account of the incompleteness of sense in a sentence, is called साकाङ्क्ष. It shows that the sense of a sentence is not complete unless another sentence is assumed to follow it. When another sentence is thus supplied, the intonation required to show that the sense is complete, is called निराकाङ्क्ष. The साकाङ्क्ष काकु (Expectant intonation) can still further be subdivided into three varieties to express an objection, a question and a conjecture; while the निराकाङ्क्ष काकु (Non-expectant intonation) also can be subdivided into three varieties to denote a statement, an answer and a decision. The same sentence can be shown to be complete or incomplete simply by the use of proper intonation. Thus the change of intonation employed in the same sentence implying an objection, a question and a conjecture, can be made to imply a statement, an answer and a decision respectively. This being the case, the two main varieties of intonation with their subdivisions are mutually related. There are other countless varieties of intonation, which are devoid of any mutual relation, but which express several subtle emotions. They denote acceptance, entreaty, ridicule, consent or approval, affirmation, concealment of feelings, sorrow or repentance, roughness, encouragement, ardent desire or eagerness, despondency or disgust, etc.

More than one of the various intonations can be combined in several ways in a sentence or verse to express various emotions. The use of intonation is not only prevalent in ordinary speech, but it reigns supreme even in Shastras, and it is, as it

were, the life of poetry. Intonation allied with flawless pronunciation not only reveals change in meaning, but also unfolds the skill of a trained person in expressive acting A poet, therefore, should compose poetry and an intelligent reader should *read it in such a manner, that the reading would* shed a new light on the minds of hearers An adept in the poetic art might compose poetry in any way he likes, but he, whose speech is accomplished, knows how to read Just as good voice is the result of repeated practice in the previous birth, so excellence in reading is attained after many births

V Embellishments— The six embellishments (पाठ्यालङ्कारः) which lend charm and colour to read ing and recitation are the varieties of the three pitches तार, मन्द्र and मध्य, as stated above Thus, the high pitch (तार) can be subdivided into उच्च and दीप्त, the low pitch (मन्द्र) into मन्द्र and नीच, and the middle one (मध्य) into द्रुत and विलम्बित.

The उच्च sound, which is synonymous with the तार or high pitch, is produced in the head or palate and is used while speaking with a person at a distance or calling him, while expressing astonishment or frightening another person, and in an exchange of hot words The दीप्त sound also rises from the head or palate, but being higher than उच्च or तार, it is used to act a quarrel, debate, refutation, delirium, violence, expostulation, anger, heroism, haughtiness or harshness of words

The low sound (मन्द्र) comes out of the chest or lungs and is used to express despair, fatigue,

hesitation or fear anxiety, pitiable condition, uneasiness, sickness, wounded state, swooning or drunkenness The नीच sound which also comes out of the chest is lower than the मन्द्र. It represents speech in a normal state of mind or signifies sickness, fatigue, fear, swooning, etc, in an extreme form

The द्रुत sound, a variety of the middle pitch (मध्य), is produced *rapidly* in the throat or glottis to show stumbling, whirling sensation, lust, fear, shivering, vexation, etc, and to communicate an affair which is not secret The other variety of the middle pitch is the विलम्बित tone, which is produced *slowly* in the glottis to express amour, conjecture, deliberation, indignation, jealousy, lisping, bashfulness or shame, anxiety, threatening, wonder, fault-finding, and prolonged displeasure

Several permutations and combinations of these embellishments of pitch and intonation can be made in reading to show blendings of different sentiments Thus while dramatizing the sentiments of love humour and pathos, intonation with the विलम्बित pitch should be used, while expressing the sentiments of heroism, wrath and wonder, the pitch of intonation should be दीप्त and उच्च, and while suggesting fear or disgust, the pitch should be द्रुत and नीच. These combinations being too minute to be enumerated, mere theorizing in this matter is of less value than practice Keen observation of human behaviour and repeated practice in this imitative art can impart skill in the blendings of different sentiments.

VI. Auxiliaries—Lastly, the six auxiliaries of reading (पाठ्याङ्ग) are the break or pause (विच्छेद-विराम), resonance (अर्पण), emphasis (विसर्ग), phrasing (अनुबन्ध), the upward glide of voice (दीपन) and the downward glide (प्रशमन).

(1) *Pause*—The break or pause is to be made with a definite purpose according to the completion of meaning either in a sentence or after letters varying in number from one to four. These purposeful or psychological pauses, which are the exponents of meaning, should be differentiated from the pauses (यति) in prosody. So, not only in the reading of prose but also in the recitation of poetry, attention should be paid more to the psychological than to the metrical pauses

Effort should be made to show these pauses along with gestures (वाचिकाभिनय), since gestures bring out the sense of a passage in full relief. Gestures in reading and recitation consist of the movement of hands and eyes along with the pauses indicating the sense. While expressing the sentiments of heroism and wrath, the hands should be in the position of striking with a weapon, while showing the sentiments of repulsion, they should be contracted as if in contempt, while representing humour and pathos, they should be stretched according to the respective purpose of those sentiments; and while acting the sentiments of astonishment and fear, they should stand still as if in amazement and terror respectively Thus the movement of

hands allied with pauses and embellishments aids the definite comprehension of meaning.

We may then say in general that pauses are to be used either after inflected words or after the completion of meaning. In the case of an unusually lengthy compound, however, breaks or pauses are to be made after as many members of that compound as can be uttered in a single breath. Care, of course, must be taken to utter the compound in such a way that its individual members are distinctly shown without breaking their unity as a componud. But in all other cases, the sense alone would decide where one should pause.

The next question arises as to how long the reader should pause according to the sense. Broadly speaking, if despair, intolerance or change of mood is to be shown, and if a question is to be put, the pause should be made for about eight seconds But in the case of other sentiments, the length of the pause should vary according to the sense from eight to forty-eight seconds. Even if a letter before the pause is long (दीर्घ), the pause should not be unduly lengthened; i. e, the length of that pause should not exceed forty-eight seconds. In the recitation of poetry, the pauses in a particular metre should be decided with due attention to the sentiments therein. The reader should not corrupt words in his reading, nor recite a verse in a wrong metre, nor pause where he ought not to, nor read without emotion and intonation. In good recitation verses are set to proper tunes, with due regard to

the length of the pause, beats of time (ताल), rhythm (लय) and completeness of sense.

(2) *Resonance*-The voice should be so used with ease and charm that the whole place, where reading or recitation is going on, should resound with it This is, of course, to be accomplished with due consideration to the other characteristics of good reading and to the heightening of the main sentiment (स्थायिभाव) with the help of fleeting emotions (व्यभिचारिभाव).

(3) *Emphasis* (विमर्श)-Words as well as clauses in a sentence should be read with proper emphasis according to their relative importance, so that monotony in speech or reading might be avoided. Forethought will have to be devoted to the ascertainment of the places needing emphasis

(4) *Phrasing* (अनुबन्ध)-A word or words are to be grouped with the preceding or following ones to suit the meaning of a passage This is called 'phrasing' in English, and it depends as much upon the grammatical construction of a sentence as upon breath For instance, adjectives should be grouped with their substantives and adverbs with their verbs. Generally, in the construction of a Sanskrit sentence the बहुव्रीहि compound, doing the work of an adjective predominates If many such adjectives of considerable length follow one another, the grouping of words, as shown above, will not be possible The reader should, in this case, stop a little and connect the preceding

adjective immediately with the following one in such a way that all such adjectives together might be taken to belong to the same part of speech and then grouped with their substantive

In 'phrasing' the question of observing *Sandhis* sets in In the reading of poetry many *Sandhis* are observed for fear that the rules of prosody might be violated But in the reading of prose as well as in *Speech*, सन्धिs are rarely observed even by the reputed Shastris This practice of the Shastris is corroborated by a well-known Sanskrit verse † which says that the *Sandhi*, in an inflected word between a root and its prefix, and in a compound, is compulsory (नित्य), while in a sentence it is optional, i. e, it depends upon the speaker s will From this rule we may generalize that सन्धिs between the different words of a sentence need not be observed in order that our reading might be intelligible to the hearers We may still further say that in the reading of a passage, the quick and ready separation of सन्धिs in the words of a sentence testifies to the better understanding of the reader. नित्यसन्धिs however, must be observed in reading and speech, since the idea of organic unity or oneness is always implied in an inflected word, a root with its prefix and a compound In the observation of नित्यसन्धिs, assimilation of sounds takes place and it further helps the reader to simplify the articulation of letters (vowels and consonants) The separa-

† संहितैकपदे नित्या नित्या धातूपसर्गयोः ।
नित्या समासे वाक्ये तु सा विवक्षामपेक्षते ॥

tion of श्रुतिस, even in the three varieties above specified, is artificial and not much conducive to the comprehension of meaning. It may then be stated in general that श्रुतिस are useful more for the purpose of writing than that of reading and speaking.

(5-6) *Inflexion*—Both दीपन and प्रशमन together are called 'Inflexion' in English दीपन is the upward glide of voice In दीपन, the reader or speaker should take particular care that his voice glides upwards through the pitches मन्द्र, मध्य and तार, and does not *rise abruptly in a discordant manner* On the other hand, in प्रशमन the voice should glide downwards through the तार, मध्य and मन्द्र pitches in succession.

While expressing humour and erotic sentiment a sentence should be read with the use of resonance, pauses, upward glide and downward glide, while representing pathos, heroism and wonder, it should be read with pauses, downward glide, resonance, upward glide and phrasing, and while showing repulsion and fear, it should be read with pauses and resonance.

Conclusion—In short, sweetness and distinctness of letters, proper separation of words, good voice, composure (gravity) and rhythm or assimilation of sounds are the six qualities of reading The reading, which is accompanied by intonation, where pauses are made with due attention to the sense, and where articulation of individual letters is distinct and pleasing to the ear, is graceful. Again, depth of voice, harmony, proper finish of

high and low sounds, and charming utterance of conjunct consonants are the characteristics of good reading A tigress while carrying her young ones in her jaws does not hurt them with her tusks, yet holds them fast lest they should fall; letters should be articulated in the same manner. In other words, letters should neither be articulated indistinctly nor stressed unduly. One who properly articulates letters is held in great esteem. In good reading case-terminations are distinctly shown, compounds are not deformed and सन्धिs are not unnaturally split. An intelligent reader, therefore, should not unite detached words, separate compounds or mutilate the verbal form. The essence of good reading is, then, the making of pauses suited to the sense and the articulation of letters according to the five varieties of utterance, viz, accent, time-measure, pitch and internal as well as external effort.

On the other hand, reading in a sing-song fashion, unnecessary haste, purposeless nodding of the head, mere repetition of what is written, non-comprehension of meaning and feeble voice are the six faults of reading. Again, the reading, which is too speedy or too slow, loud or inaudible, too harsh or too mild, and in which words are separated wrongly and uttered indistinctly, is faulty. *

---

* पाणिनीयशिक्षा, verses 25 & 31-37. काव्यमीमांसा, Chap. VII; भरतनाट्यशास्त्रम्, अ. १९.

Part III - Practice

THE STUDY AND TEACHING OF SANSKRIT LITERATURE.

Now that a sound theoretical basis of the Hindu Methodology has been supplied here for Sanskrit teaching, the teachers of Sanskrit should not be sceptical about the methods to be adopted by them. The only thing that is required of them is genuine love for Sanskrit (language and literature), constant study of it, and inner urge for the improvement of its teaching The Sanskrit teachers (in schools and colleges), must, *therefore, remember that no* half-hearted attempts from the sole point of view of examinations will do here Their sole aim must be to try heart and soul to popularize the study of Sanskrit irrespective of material gain, and that aim will, it is hoped, be achieved, if the *theory* of Sanskrit teaching as detailed in the former part and the *practical procedure,* that will be demonstrated in this part in the light of that theory, will be known and employed in actual teaching. Hence, for the proper application and general adoption of the खण्डान्वयपद्धति in secondary schools, it would not be out of place to suggest here an improved procedure, which, in combination with the Western *methods of language-teaching,* could be advanta-

geously followed as supplementary to the method of खण्डान्वय, while giving explanations.

In the study of Sanskrit literature it is advisable to begin with prose rather than with poetry, if the principle of gradation should be attended to. At the initial stage, pupils, who are generally more familiar with the language of prose in the mother-tongue than that of poetry, can grasp and master Sanskrit prose easily, though occasional use of simple सुभाषित may be recommended for the sake of variety. Now, lessons in Sanskrit prose mostly comprise descriptions; stories, dialogues or passages from dramas and rarely reflective passages, the story-form of literature predominating over others.

The first requisite, therefore, is that of *a good text-book* containing a variety of such interesting prose lessons graded in vocabulary and other linguistic aspects. Good Sanskrit text-books must be written for the elementary and intermediate stages, after taking into account the Hindu culture in which the pupils are brought up and also the recognized principles according to which good text-books are written in the West. The subject-matter of text-books should be connected, varied and interesting, and not monotonous or representing only one type of literature. It should embody descriptions of Nature, dialogues, mythological stories, folklore and fairy tales, stories of animals and a few reflective passages, all of which are to be culled from the vast range of Sanskrit literature. For the initial stages, lessons will have to be newly written in

simple prose, so as to suit the capacities of beginners Topics in text-books should be familiar to students, yet they should not be childish, since students, when they begin to learn Sanskrit, are comparatively advanced in age and understanding Select mythological stories from the महाभारत and the रामायण, folk-lore, fairy-tales and legends from works like the कथासरित्सागर, भोजप्रबन्ध, वेतालपञ्चविंशति, etc, humorous animal stories from the पञ्चतन्त्र and the हितोपदेश, and descriptions of Nature, in various seasons, from the रामायण may be taken and kept as models for re-writing the same in easy prose Although a few reflective and moral passages from the works like the मनुस्मृति, चाणक्यनीति, *etc, may be taken and* transformed into prose, they should not be abstruse or abstract, but should bear upon the life of students Readers for beginners should contain more prose than poetry, which should be gradually introduced, in accordance with the development of students' understanding *Simple and concrete* सुभाषित *and* स्तोत्रs containing graphic descriptions of deities may be introduced at the initial stage, after which original poetic passages from the रामायण, महाभारत, रघुवंश, etc., should be included in the text-books for the intermediate and advanced stages, along with original and simple extracts from the दशकुमारचरित, कादम्बरी, etc No passages from the Vedas, ब्राह्मणs or उपनिषद्s should be taken in the text-books for schools, since the Vedic Sanskrit is an antiquated form of language, while the Classical

Sanskrit is akin to the vocabulary, idiom and structure of the mother-tongue. It is also seen that the commentaries on the Vedic literature have been written in Classical Sanskrit, which is naturally the main door through which the Vedic literature can be approached. If any interesting matter for school pupils is to be culled from the Vedic literature, it should be presented in the garb of Classical Sanskrit. The language, therefore, that must be used in the text-books for schools should be after the models of Classical Sanskrit. For beginners, easy and interesting descriptions and dialogues bearing upon the experience of students will have to be newly written in imitation of good descriptions in Sanskrit literature and of the colloquial style of classical dramas; while in the readers for advanced pupils original, descriptive and dramatic passages from भास, कालिदास, बाण, भवभूति, etc., may be inserted. The lessons to be read at the initial stage should be short, and those at the advanced stage may be a little longer.

words current in the mother-tongue Particularly in the first lessons in Sanskrit no सन्धिs should be *observed, and there should be a large proportion* of तत्सम words. When सन्धिs and समासs are to be introduced in lessons, they should be used gradually. New words in a passage should be judiciously distributed over a number of *lessons*, and the same words should recur in different *contexts Necessary grammatical facts should also* be distributed over various lessons, but they must be *made subservient to the literary charm of ideas* Some irregularities in language are indispensable and may find their way in text-books so as not to allow pupils to form an impression that Sanskrit language is composed only of regular forms, yet those irregularities must be much less in number than regularities The types of sentences to be employed in the text-books *for beginners* should generally consist of simple and compound sentences, complex ones being used in those for advanced pupils.

Sanskrit text-books should, moreover, be *supplied with intelligent questions and exercises on* the subject-matter and language of individual lessons Illustrations, that would be helpful in explaining the text and would aid the imagination of pupils, may, of course, be presented to add to the attractiveness of books. At the end of every reader organized lists of ready-made grammatical forms of nouns *and* verbs *may be appended for* frequent reference In this way, there should be

three or four graduated readers that would make a gradual approach to Classical Sanskrit.

Before beginning the study of textbooks one fact must be taken into consideration that pupils are generally found to possess a vocabulary of more than 800 तत्सम words,* as frequently met with in the mother-tongue, by the time they begin to study Sanskrit in English schools It is worthy of note here that the vocabulary of Basic English consists of 850 words only. Owing to this advantage, Hindu pupils, after the learning of Sanskrit inflexions and their functions, can grasp at least the general sense of a simple Sanskrit passage, story, or verse, though not its details, even before its explantion or translation is attempted Again, even if translation from Sanskrit into the mother-tongue be attempted, the translation of तत्सम words is the translation of inflexions rather than that of those words, as many of them are, and can be, retained in the vernacular translation without any change. These are some of the reasons why Sanskrit can be used with advantage as a medium of instruction and why the exclusive use of the Translation Method is superfluous in the teaching of Sanskrit. Thus Sanskrit is not a foreign language like English to Hindu pupils, who have

* We have given this approximate number after counting Sanskrit words in Marathi text-books studied by pupils from the primary to the secondary stage. This number has not, however, been corroborated by giving vocabulary tests to pupils

an aptitude for picking up its general sense; and the more they are advanced in the study of their mother-tongue, the more their general understanding of Sanskrit is developed.

We shall now see how this general understanding of Sanskrit is further developed in the various purposeful steps of *prose lessons*.

The teaching of literature is conducted through three successive types of lessons, viz., (1) General Study, (2) Detailed Study, and (3) Review or Revision. The division of procedure in each lesson into three main stages, viz., (1) Preparation or Introduction, (2) Presentation or Development, and (3) Application or Conclusion, is more practicable and *elastic than the rigid process of the five formal* steps of Herbart. Let us now turn to the 'Preparation' stage—

I. PREPARATION

(a) *Introduction of words*-At the elementary stage all the concrete and unknown words in a new lesson are introduced by the teacher in direct association with objects, actions, sketches, diagrams or *pictures. Personal pronouns, 'action' verbs,* concrete nouns, concrete adjectives and concrete indeclinables can be well introduced by using these concrete devices. Such words are to be introduced by the teacher in the context of a familiar topic and not in a disconnected manner. As *the unit of language is a sentence,* these words are to be used in *sentences which should all be mutually* connected to form a link or association of ideas.

These short sentences develop, as it were, into a series of little descriptions of objects and actions shown. If proper association of ideas with objects, etc., is formed, pupils can easily learn and recollect new words and phrases thus introduced, since suitable context is a good aid to memory. This is really a relieving feature of the new method and it serves to develop a proper mental attitude of pupils towards Sanskrit. On the other hand, pupils taught by the Translation Method have to undergo the tedious process of memorizing lengthy word-lists, which are, of course, unsuccessfully recollected and reproduced by them for want of context. In addition to the association of ideas enough sense-appeal is made to give a concrete aspect to the subject-matter, as follows—

(a) *Nouns* with their nominative singular forms so as to show their different genders and endings,

(b) *Adjectives* in their original form without any gender to show that they agree with nouns in all genders, and

(c) *Verbs* with their third person singular forms of the present tense to suggest their different conjugations (गण्स). Again, words of different parts of speech may be arranged in separate columns. Pupils are to take down in their note-books these new words in the same order in which they are being written by the teacher on the black-board, so that along with hearing and repeating, they can practise *the correct writing of those words with their hands.* Accuracy must be observed in pronunciation, writing, and semanticizing, proportionate attention being devoted to each of these aspects.† This process involves hearing or reception, repetition or ready reproduction, and unconscious assimilation of language, for which spontaneous capacities of pupils for learning language are utilized *Briskness in this oral drill* helps proper assimilation of language, as pupils are given no time for mental translation In this process three senses, viz , ears, tongue and eyes are appealed to, and the principle of 'Gradation' is followed by making use of (a) ears before eyes, (b) reception before reproduction, (c) oral reproduction before reading, (d) immediate memory before prolonged memory, (e) chorus work before individual work, and (f) drill work before free work † In chorus work pupils'

† Read 'Principles of Language-study' by H. E. Palmer.

will, however, have to be taken to drill some of those words for removing the vernacular influence, *for introducing their correct Sanskrit forms* and *for showing their proper pronunciation*. But under no circumstances should the teacher try to elicit new words from the pupils, supposing that they might be known to them. Nobody should here suppose that exclusive use of Sanskrit is to be made throughout the whole lesson. *The use of the Sanskrit medium is to be made for cultivating good language habits which will ultimately serve as a means to good reading.*

Importance of oral drill had been already recognized by the reciters of the Vedas and the *sequence of stages in it had been actually followed* by them in their recitation, long before the Vedas were committed to writing. In spite of the existence of their printed texts at present, oral reproduction of the Vedas is still held in great esteem. Thus the oral drill in language lessons is just like the 'आवर्तन' or 'सथा' of Vedic students, who are still found repeating after their preceptor *in chorus* as well as *individually*. The first lesson in the study of the Vedas begins with the recitation of the गायत्रीमन्त्र at the time of the उपनयन ceremony. The गृह्यसूत्रs describe the procedure of this recitation in the following way: "The pupil, after invoking the deities for bestowing Memory (मेधा) and spiritual power (तेजस्) on himself, requests the preceptor to teach him the गायत्री, which also contains an invocation for developing understanding. The preceptor is to recite the

मन्त्र thrice in the following manner: First, in order to enable the pupil to follow him well, the teacher should stop after every quarter of the verse, then after every hemistich and lastly he should recite the whole verse, the pupil every time repeating after him. According to the *capacity* of the pupil, the preceptor should, in the beginning, cause him to recite even four letters each time". This clearly shows that the Vedic teachers did not desire their pupils merely to repeat mechanically but wanted them to be coupled with understanding, since the deities were invoked for the gift of Understanding, Memory and Spiritual power. $

The ऋग्वेदप्रातिशाख्य, which sets down minute phonetic rules relating to the recitation of the ऋग्वेद, gives a detailed procedure for recitation. The important part of it is as follows:-In order to give a clear suggestion to his pupils the teacher should pronounce particular words *twice*. Generally a collection of three ऋक्s (verses) to be studied is called a प्रश्न. If the प्रश्न contains a compound, the teacher should pronounce one word only; and if there is no compound, he should recite two words.

$ मयि मेधा मयि प्रजां मय्यग्निस्तेजो दधातु ... ... इत्युपस्थाय ब्रूयात्–अधीहि भोः सावित्रीं भो अनुब्रूहीति ... सावित्रीमन्वाह पच्छोऽर्धर्चशः सर्वाम् । यथाशक्ति वाचयीत । (आश्व. गृ. सू. १।२१।४–६); (आप. गृ. सू. प. ४, ख. ११, ८–१०);–तस्मा अन्वाह 'तत्सवितु' रिति। पच्छोऽर्धर्चशस्ततस्सर्वाम् (९–१०) ।

अथास्मै सावित्रीमन्वाह पच्छोऽर्धर्चशः सर्वां च तृतीयेन सहावर्तयन् ।

– कात्यायनसूत्रम् २।३।

Then the first pupil on his right side should repeat the first word and others should repeat the same after him *in chorus* After thus finishing one प्रश्न, all the pupils should repeat the whole of it again and again" Here, the part and whole methods of memorizing seem to have been combined (ऋक्प्राति १५।५–६,९, १३–१४) †

Again, *the modern introduction of words in direct association with actions and objects bears much resemblance to the sacrificial procedure followed by priests, who perform successive actions in a sacrifice in association with मन्त्रs and sentences describing those actions* If the Sanskrit teacher adjusts the same procedure to the instincts and capacities of children for teaching them Classical Sanskrit, he will find almost no difference between *that procedure and the modern one for introducing* words Moreover, in language-learning the Hindu schools of thought have already taken account of the tendency of *imitation* They have given due prominence to the *usage of elders* (वृद्धव्यवहार) in the denotative function of words and acknowledged the principle that *language can be better learnt by use* (व्यवहार) No one should, therefore, form an opinion that this procedure is foreign to Sanskrit or that the Direct Method of teaching Sanskrit is a blind imitation of the Westerners.

† गुरु शिष्यस्य पदमाह मुख्य समासश्चेदसमासो यदि द्वे ।
एतेन कल्पेन समाप्य प्रश्न प्रत्याम्नायुस्त पुनरेव सर्वे ॥
—ऋग्वेदप्रातिशाख्यम् १५।१

(b) *Other ways of introducing a lesson*—This oral practice of new words in a lesson before its reading is quite in keeping with the principles of language-study If new words in a lesson are thus independently introduced at the 'preparation' stage, the whole lesson to be studied becomes automatically intelligible to the pupils, and the reading of that lesson can be conducted without repeated interruptions of explanation It must be here remembered that *only concrete words can thus be introduced at the initial stage* At the advanced stage, however, this device proves to be inadequate, and ideas contained in abstract words or subtle shades of meanings of peculiar expressions cannot be explained except in the proper context of the passage to be studied, since difficulties of classical authors are rooted in their context.

So, at the intermediate and advanced stages familiar experiences of pupils might be awakened and connected with the unknown ones by starting at the 'preparation' stage *an oral discussion bearing upon the topic of the lesson* If, for instance, the story 'बुद्धिर्यस्य बलं तस्य' is to be studied, the general characteristics (residence, food, appearance, nature, etc,) of the hare and the lion may be elicited through *questions in Sanskrit or the mother-tongue* If possible, a few unknown words in the story may be introduced through a suitable picture and be drilled as above indicated But the more the pupils are advanced, the less there is an occasion for independent word-practice Sometimes the oral discussion may be based on *a familiar topic*

relating to the theme of the lesson, without in the least revealing the main theme, and merely making it serve as an 'introduction' to the lesson If the subject-matter be prematurely disclosed in the introduction, the pupils would lose interest in the 'presentation' stage Such *an introductory talk may sometimes be continued in the mother-tongue.* In any case, the teacher should try his best to raise a problem in the introduction and awaken the curiosity of pupils, so that they might be well prepared to receive the new matter at the 'presentation' stage

II PRESENTATION

(a) *Story-telling*-At the elementary and intermediate stages the general study of a *prose lesson* begins with story-telling or oral reproduction of a passage, in simple Sanskrit Since the principles of language-study lay down that *hearing must precede reading*, and since language can be more effectively mastered by ear-imitation than by actual reading or rules, pupils must be given opportunities of hearing language before reading. The oral reproduction of a story with the teacher s living voice, gestures, emphasis, etc , is doubtless more enlivening than the reading of the same from the cold print Moreover, a clear idea of the story *as a whole* being given with much economy of time, the pupils can afterwards begin their reading with the *synthetic view* of the whole and with more understanding At the advanced stage this story-telling will become unnecessary,

but it may be attempted in the general study, only if a story is unduly lengthy.

What should be the *medium for story-telling* depends upon the individual ability of the teacher. If he feels quite at home in Sanskrit and is possessed of the art of expressive 'telling', he should use *Sanskrit* alone for story-telling. On the other hand, if he feels diffident of using the Sanskrit medium, or if the difficult nature of a particular story or passage demands the *use of the mother-tongue*, he may freely employ the medium of the mother-tongue. The use of the Sanskrit medium for story-telling is, however, not beyond the capacities of average teachers, who will be able to acquit themselves well after a little practice.

A story is generally *told twice* for deepening its impression. If the teacher wants to use the mother-tongue, an improvement can be suggested. The teacher may make a gradual approach to the language of the original by first telling it in the mother-tongue and then in simple Sanskrit, so that Sanskrit atmosphere is preserved in the lesson. In case a story is already known to the pupils, one of them should be encouraged to tell it in the mother-tongue and then the teacher should tell it in Sanskrit. In such cases the subject-matter being known, the form of the language is the unknown, which is to be studied.

The interest of the pupils in the novelty of a story need not slacken, even if it is told more than once. If a story is really good and if its telling is

expressive enough, the pupils are not tired of two hearings at least On the contrary, if story-telling is merely a cold reproduction of the original, and if the teacher cannot use the Sanskrit medium confidently, story-telling is bound to be a failure and the pupils, instead of hearing it, are naturally tempted to read it in their text-books It may be noted here that the pupils are not to be allowed to open their text-books while the story is being told

It is worthy of note that many Shastris are endowed with this skill in 'expressive telling', particularly story-telling, to such a high degree that they can make their pupils spell-bound by it Sanskrit teachers must, therefore, do their best to acquire or develop this skill They must also realize that *the expressive telling of a story is certainly more impressive than even the expressive reading of the same from a book* For, the teacher, with a keen dramatic sense, being free from the impediment of a book, gets full scope for making his living presence felt more, and enabling the pupils to live in the actual atmosphere of the story For example, if there are several characters in a story or a dramatic piece, a skilful teacher in his 'telling' can play their role and reproduce their speeches effectively. This skill stands him in good stead even in reading and explanation

(b) *General questions*-In order to test how far the pupils have followed or understood the story, general questions may be asked *either in the mother-tongue or in Sanskrit.* These questions may be based on the main stages of the story, so that the

teacher, can elicit the general drift of the whole. The number of questions may depend upon the main stages of the story; yet generally it should not exceed *three*. Under no circumstances should teachers waste their time asking pupils to repeat correct answers to general questions.

(c) *Model Reading* $ *by the Teacher*-General questions will be followed by the teacher's model reading, which must be practised by him beforehand, if it should be a model one. After the pupils have received enough *oral practice* in new words and after they have got the opportunity of *hearing* the story, *oral (loud) reading* by the teacher is quite necessary; for, the teacher does all this *oral work* for ultimately approaching the language of the text-book, *i. e., as a preparation for, or a means to intelligent reading.* Pupils should here be asked to open their books and follow the model reading silently in them. The teacher, simply by his expressive *reading*, can now give his pupils indirect instructions in correct pronunciation, phrasing, pause, emphasis, intonation, etc., so as to facilitate understanding. In his reading the teacher should dissolve all संधि in a passage, as the observation of संधि is optional in Sanskrit † and as *the splitting of* संधि *facilitates understanding.* This reading by the teacher is a sort of explanation, and it helps the pupils to make an intelligent approach to the

$ See 'Reading and Recitation'.

† संहितैकपदे नित्या नित्या धातूपसर्गयोः ।
नित्या समासे वाक्ये तु सा विवक्षामपेक्षते ॥

original language of a lesson in the light of their general understanding of the same in oral reproduction.

(d) *Chorus reading*-At the elementary stage the model reading by the teacher is sometimes followed by chorus reading, which the teacher may give at his discretion either before detailed questioning, or after it If it is given before detailed questioning, *it enables the pupils to reproduce orally the language of the story, and thus bringing them in closer touch with the language of the text, it prepares them well for giving intelligent answers in the detailed study* This chorus reading may be dropped at the advanced stage.

(e) *Silent reading*-The model reading by the teacher may be followed by the silent *reading of pupils* This *silent reading is suitable for the advanced stage only,* as pupils at the elementary stage prefer self-expression and self-activity to silence and passivity To be able to tackle a problem well in its details, it is first necessary to observe hurriedly its main aspects Hence, the purpose of this silent reading is to cause the pupils, at the beginning of a lesson, *to get the proper perspective or general trend of a passage as a whole* by going through it rapidly, i e, the pupils are to discover the main points of a lesson, their mutual relations and the proper place of each point in the whole scheme They are also to note important and difficult portions of the lesson and distinguish between essentials and non-essentials. They

can thus be *made to tackle the general meaning of a passage* by themselves and are trained in self-help. If the general idea of the whole is to be obtained by noting the essentials, briskness is quite necessary in silent reading. It has been experimentally proved that understanding depends much upon speed in silent reading. It is, therefore, very desirable to develop this practice gradually among the pupils, since 'silent reading' is the only variety of reading calculated to be *of much use in later life.* This rapid silent reading of a passage well prepares the pupils to enter upon the detailed study of the same in an intelligent manner.

If 'silent reading' is to go on methodically and yield good results, it should *proceed along the central theme of a passage* or a comprehensive problem, for the solution of which *two* or *three objectives* may be given. With this end in view the teacher, after *thorough preparation at home,* should find out the main points, determine their interrelations, anticipate the linguistic difficulties of pupils and frame questions for study in the class. The objectives, which are based on the main divisions of a theme or problem, may be presented in the class before the silent reading commences, so that pupils should read the lesson with a definite purpose.

When the silent reading is going on, the teacher should move about in the class and help the pupils to solve their common difficulties by supplying the meanings of a few unknown words

original language of a lesson in the light of their general understanding of the same in oral reproduction.

(d) *Chorus reading*-At the elementary stage the model reading by the teacher is sometimes followed by chorus reading which the teacher may give at his discretion either before detailed questioning, or after it If it is given before detailed questioning, it enables the pupils to reproduce orally the language of the story and thus bringing them in closer touch with the language of the text, it prepares them well for giving intelligent answers in the detailed study This chorus reading may be dropped at the advanced stage

(e) *Silent reading*-The model reading by the teacher may be followed by the silent reading of pupils This silent reading is suitable for the advanced stage only, as pupils at the elementary stage prefer *self-expression and self-activity to silence and passivity* To be able to tackle a problem well in its details, it is first necessary to observe hurriedly its main aspects Hence, the purpose of this silent reading is to cause the pupils, at the beginning of a lesson, *to get the proper perspective or general trend of a passage as a whole* by going through it rapidly, i e, the pupils are to discover the main points of a lesson, their mutual relations and the proper place of each point in the whole scheme They are also to note important and difficult portions of the lesson and distinguish between essentials and non-essentials. They

can thus be *made to tackle the general meaning of a passage* by themselves and are trained in self-help. If the general idea of the whole is to be obtained by noting the essentials, briskness is quite necessary in silent reading. It has been experimentally proved that understanding depends much upon speed in silent reading. It is, therefore, very desirable to develop this practice gradually among the pupils, since 'silent reading' is the only variety of reading calculated to be *of much use in later life.* This rapid silent reading of a passage well prepares the pupils to enter upon the detailed study of the same in an intelligent manner.

If 'silent reading' is to go on methodically and yield good results, it should *proceed along the central theme of a passage* or a comprehensive problem, for the solution of which *two* or *three objectives* may be given. With this end in view the teacher, after *thorough preparation at home,* should find out the main points, determine their interrelations, anticipate the linguistic difficulties of pupils and frame questions for study in the class. The objectives, which are based on the main divisions of a theme or problem, may be presented in the class before the silent reading commences, so that pupils should read [the lesson with a definite purpose.

When the silent reading is going on, the teacher should move about in the class and help the pupils to solve their common difficulties by *supplying the meanings* of a few unknown words

orally or on the black-board The meanings may be given either in the form of simpler Sanskrit equivalents or words in the mother-tongue, or both. Later on, the use *of a small Sanskrit dictionary* may be recommended to pupils for looking up unknown words. After the silent reading is over, answers to the objectives may be elicited either immediately or in the detailed questioning. If they are elicited immediately, the teacher should take particular care to connect the objectives properly to the detailed questioning in such a way that the detailed study might be a natural development of the objectives indicating the main problem. Better still to reserve the answers to the objectives for the 'recapitulation stage' which unifies all the salient features in the form of a summary and maintains the organic unity of the whole lesson.

(*i*) *Detailed questioning and explanation*— The detailed study of a passage commences after all this preparation in the 'general study', which facilitates general understanding and gives the synthetic idea of the passage as a whole If the lesson is unduly lengthy, it may be divided into *convenient units for detailed study.* What then remains for the teacher to do is to draw the attention of his pupils, in the light of general understanding, to important words, phrases or expressions which are elicited, through questions, by him in the form of answers from the pupils and then explained fully in Sanskrit. This explanation is to be supplied not hurriedly but distinctly and slowly,

so that pupils should be able to follow it easily. *Explanation in Sanskrit* is not an innovation imported from the West; for, almost *all the commentaries on Sanskrit works are in Sanskrit* and not in the mother-tongue. Those who advocate exclusive use of the mother-tongue for explanation, should sufficiently account for the absence of commentaries in the mother-tongue from ancient times up to the present day. Thus explanation in simple Sanskrit is quite in consonance with the traditional method of teaching language.

It must be remembered here that *questions* in ' language lessons ' are to be employed not only *for testing the understanding of pupils,* but also *for eliciting difficult and important portions* in the text with a view to supplying their clear explanation. Of course, the teacher should *allow his pupils to keep their text-books* open for enabling them to find out and note important points and supply them in the form of answers to questions. This process of questioning involves the anticipation of the difficulties of pupils and *eliciting them for the purpose of giving explanation.* In following this procedure we can quote no better authority than that of the Sanskrit commentaries written according to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, in which detailed explanations are supplied after eliciting the words of the text through typical questions. Furthermore, as already stated, the खण्डान्वयपद्धति is mainly based on the psychological principle of expectancy or curiosity (आकाङ्क्षा) which is to be awakened (उत्थाप्य) by

the teacher among his pupils by raising a problem or creating the need for explanation through questions. When pupils are thus employed in the activity of finding *out important things in the text* through such questions, the need for explanation being naturally created in their minds, the teacher can give his explanation at the psychological moment There are, therefore, two types of questions, viz, (1) *Testing Questions* and (2) *Teaching Questions*. *Testing Questions* do not aim at the search for new knowledge, but are used for awakening the 'apperception masses' of pupils, i e, for reviving and ascertaining their former knowledge and for connecting it with the new one Thus questions for *testing* the understanding of pupils are asked either on portions previously studied by them or on those already intelligible to them They are, therefore, asked mostly in the 'Preparation' and 'Application' stages of a new lesson, and in Revision Lessons On the other hand, *Teaching Questions* awaken the curiosity of pupils to acquire new knowledge and are generally employed in the 'Presentation' stage or detailed study The instinct of curiosity is roused at the sight of new things or situations that cannot be fully grasped, and induces one to search for further information or fuller knowledge of the same Teaching questions, therefore, concentrate the attention of pupils on the novelty of situations or aspects, and prepare their mental attitude to receive thorough explanations of new facts from the teacher in the form of his 'telling'. The teacher should, therefore, utilize 'teaching questions' for drawing the attention of

students to the prominent linguistic aspects of the text, for distinguishing between simple and difficult portions or essential and non-essential points and for causing the students to study the important parts more minutely. It is then obvious that 'teaching questions' are asked on the portion yet to be studied, with the view of helping students to find out important things and answer them in *the wording of the text* Moreover, 'teaching questions' help the teacher and the taught to analyse a complex whole into its component parts, a difficult problem or expression into several smaller units and a comprehensive thought into its subsidiary ideas This analysis through questions leads to the simplification, reorganization and solution of the whole problem. Every thought contains several constituents denoting persons or things, attributes, actions, time, place, manner, purpose, cause, effect, etc., and those constituents can be elicited by using in questions interrogative pronouns, adjectives and adverbs in Sanskrit (forms of किम्, कीदृश, कस्मात्, कदा, कुत्र, कथम्, किमर्थम् etc.,) as employed in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति. Corresponding to the thoughts in a literary passage to be studied, every sentence is composed of words of several parts of speech which are mutually related. The important or difficult ones of them are to be 'singled out for special attention and associated with the words in questions' (B Dumville) in such a way that they would also be *included in the answers* of students. These questioning devices, when they

are thoroughly known to pupils serve a very useful purpose in the successful development of a 'literature' lesson and can be widely used for the teaching of literature and even शास्त्र. A teacher, if he is a good judge of the capacities of his students, can anticipate their difficulties and can enunciate them as problems in the class in the form of statements and 'teaching questions' with a view to eliciting from the students the words of the text and supplying their explanation. For learning the idioms and different constructions in any unknown language and even in the detailed study of the mother-tongue the teacher is bound to utilize 'teaching questions' more than 'testing questions'. The form of 'teaching questions' and 'testing questions' is, however, the same, although the purpose in asking them varies as the matter taught is a new lesson or a 'review' lesson.

As indicated above, every sentence involves a thought process indicating doubt, discrimination, causal relation, sequence, etc. Thus every thought process represents a problem, the solution of which depends upon its analysis into minor parts *This analysis or simplification of the problem is facilitated by 'teaching questions'.* The thought process indicating a causal relation or sequence of facts generally involves an inference (अनुमान), which can be expressed in a five membered (पञ्चावयव) syllogism, and questions of a logical type are to be asked for clarifying the nature of that inference. It is thus ascertained whether the inference is

made of an effect from its cause (पूर्ववत् अनुमान), or of a cause from its effect (शेषवत्), or of common experience (सामान्यतो दृष्ट). The problem approaches solution, when the inference involved in it is stated in the form of a syllogism with its five distinct members, the third member or the concrete example (उदाहरण) helping most the clarification of an abstract thought. Such 'thought questions' for eliciting the separate members of a syllogism can, of course, be used at the advanced stage in the teaching of शास्त्र, where thought is predominant. Shastris are still found making the statement of a five-membered syllogism instead of questioning on it, when a knotty problem or an important proposition of any शास्त्र is to be well impressed on the minds of their students. It must be remembered here that *questions bringing out the synthesis, or the summing-up of thoughts are as much necessary as those used for the analysis of the same* into their component parts; and they may be asked every now and then for ascertaining how far pupils have grasped the idea of the *whole* or the former portions of the text. Instead of asking questions on the synthesis of ideas, the teacher may sometimes *express the synthesis or Purport* (तात्पर्य) *of ideas in the form of his own statement.*

In the teaching of literature, however, 'thought questions' occur in a very small degree, and 'psychological questions' enhancing the 'emotional content' of a passage and appealing to the emotions and imagination of pupils are generally to be em-

ployed Particularly, at the elementary stage, where a new language is to be learnt, there is less scope for 'thought questions' than for 'drill questions', which doubtless make for the assimilation of that language For, in language-learning the subject-matter or thought generally is, and ought to be, simpler than that in other branches of knowledge, the linguistic expression being the unknown and more important aspect of study This, however, does not mean that there is no scope in language-study for 'thought questions', which may occasionally be asked in the *mother-tongue* for removing *vagueness in the understanding of a theme* and for eliciting the causal connection of successive incidents in a lesson *In language lessons 'drill questions'* are more predominant, (of course, at the initial stage than at the *advanced stage*, and *answers* to them are given and repeated by several pupils in *the wording of the text*, so as to improve articulation and pronunciation, and to assimilate the language of the text This assimilation of language in the preceding stages gradually enlarges the understanding of pupils and enables them to take up more difficult language for study in the succeeding stages

As language is inseparably connected with ideas or thought, the *linguistic peculiarities* to be taught in 'a language lesson' cannot be dissociated from ideas contained in them Hence, questions in 'language lessons' will have to be framed in such a way that linguistic expressions and their corresponding ideas might be grasped side by side with each other *The formal study of a languge divorc-*

ed from ideas in it tends to be tedious On the other hand, linguistic expressions taught in association with ideas in literature arouse interest. The general policy in the teaching of language and literature should, therefore, be to connect language-material with thoughts or ideas, though in the study of a language at the elementary and intermediate stages, linguistic expression will predominate over ideas, and in the teaching of literature at the advanced stage ideas will be more attended to than their linguistic expression At the advanced stage also *particular idioms, phrases or constructions will have to be explained, yet they cannot be properly explained exemplified, and fixed in the mind, unless they are elicited through questions in their original wording* It is not here necessary that each and every word of the textual expressions included in the answers of pupils should have been fully understood by them For, in the general study of a passage, pupils are previously given the idea of the whole, and hence, the meaning of the textual expressions being broadly known by them, they are in a position to answer the questions of the teacher in the detailed study by intelligently including those expressions in their answers This process should not, therefore, be considered mechanical or unintelligent, since *detailed explanation of the words just elicited is immediately to be given by the teacher* Moreover, in answering such questions, pupils have actively to think over the form of the question, the matter to be included in the answer

and the wording of that answer. Again, the general *sense of the passage as a whole having* been already grasped, and even the meanings of some unknown words being guessed by the pupils in the light of the *general context, there is no reason* why the answers given by them should be *supposed* to be unintelligent or 'mechanical'. One thing must be noted here that *the highly inflexional nature of Sanskrit facilitates quick grasp of questions containing interrogative words with particular inflexions.* Those interrogative words naturally give a clue to the words with similar inflexions in the text, which can be readily reproduced by pupils in the form of answers. If the questions and answers thus going on appear hackneyed, stereotyped, or mechanical to some, then along the same line of reasoning, the inflexional character of Sanskrit itself is to blame; and further, all the Sanskrit commentaries written according to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, which best suits this character of Sanskrit, will have to be called mechanical! Those who will take into account this nature of Sanskrit and the distinguishing features of the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, will be less prone to call these questions and answers 'mechanical.'

We, however, admit that questions and answers may sometimes tend to be, mechanical, as pupils are generally inclined to include in their answers unessential words in the text, or reproduce, without understanding, the whole sentence instead of the required expressions. The teacher

should, therefore, take every possible care to check this tendency by putting *pointed questions* and accepting nothing but *pointed answers*; in other words, *he must never allow his pupils to repeat unessential words or expressions.* Experienced teachers know well enough where pupils are expected to give mechanical answers, and they can check this mechanical repetition either in the manner shown above, or by asking pupils to *translate Sanskrit expressions or sentences* thus repeated. But in all cases, translation as a test of understanding is *to follow detailed explanation in Sanskrit.*

When the teacher, as previously dealt with, tries to facilitate the understanding of pupils through the different stages of the lessons for 'general study' and 'detailed study', will it not be sheer misrepresentation of facts to say that questions and answers in Sanskrit lessons are merely mechanical? *Typical question-forms with interrogative words like 'who' (कः or का), 'which' (किम्), 'how' (कथम्), 'when' (कदा), 'where' (कुत्र), 'why' (किमर्थम्), etc., have always to be settled and utilized in the methods of teaching any language,* for the proper organization of the material to be taught. If the material thus organized in the form of questions and answers be called 'mechanical' then all the [illegible]

ing will be [illegible]

consequentl[illegible]

telligent and natural method of teaching languages!

Thus, if the pupils can grasp the general sense of a passage on account of the reasons stated above, they cannot be presumed to answer *all questions* mechanically It should, however, be acknowledged that this understanding is not perfect, and hence the need for filling in the gaps in the understanding of pupils in the detailed study by supplying *detailed explanation through questions.*

One reason why questioning in Sanskrit appears to be rigid or stereotyped is that average teachers cannot use the Sanskrit medium with facility, for want of practice or constant touch with Sanskrit literature For being able to use the Sanskrit medium with ease, it is necessary for teachers to have at their fingers ends the case-forms (विभक्ति) of nouns which are imperfectly known even by themselves *Such teachers try to conceal their own ignorance* by finding fault with the method, and after being trained are more inclined to follow the Translation Method than the Question-and-Answer Method, even if they are allowed to use the mother-tongue occasionally Much hue and cry has been raised by such teachers against the Question-and-Answer Method and the *Sanskrit Medium* has been a much vexed problem *These teachers say that real understanding is possible through the medium of the mother-tongue or English,* and that the mother-tongue may freely be used for asking questions, though they cannot show how questions are to be framed in the mother-tongue on a Sanskrit passage. There is much plausibility in saying that the mother-

tongue undoubtedly helps real understanding, but it appears strange when it is also said that the English medium helps real understanding ! If the unnatural English medium for teaching and understanding Sanskrit appears to be natural to some, it is simply the force of habit and constant touch. If it is admitted that *Sanskrit is more akin to the mother-tongue than the foreign English medium,* is it not advisable to develop practice in the Sanskrit medium rather than in the English one for Sanskrit teaching? If the English medium appears to be natural by the force of habit, *why should the Sanskrit medium not appear natural after constant practice and habit?* Sanskrit explanations are well followed by pupils, if they are gradually accustomed to them. If it is really *beneficial to use the Sanskrit medium for enriching the vocabulary of pupils,* Sanskrit teachers may be well advised to study original Sanskrit works more assiduously for cultivating facility of Sanskrit expression

It is then obligatory on every *teacher of Sanskrit* to be in close contact with Sanskrit literature and imbibe the Classical Spirit in the sole interest of his pupils No amount of the technique of teaching mastered in Training Colleges would be of any avail, unless Sanskrit teachers drink deep at the original fountain, develop their individuality by imbibing that Classical Spirit in themselves and are well equipped with the knowledge of Sanskrit to arouse intrinsic interest and *supply Sanskrit explanation in the manner of Sanskrit commentaries.* Much of the hue and cry raised against the Sanskrit

medium would be silenced if it would be perfectly realized that *commentaries on Sanskrit works are in Sanskrit*, even if Sanskrit has ceased to be a spoken language Sanskrit speech is more apt and easy than any other medium for teaching Sanskrit literature, and it can be mastered after some practice The crux of the whole situation is that teachers are reluctant to study Sanskrit literature afresh, with particular attention to the beauty of expression, and to put in more effort in their lessons Why should Sanskrit teachers not condescend to understand the importance of being more and more efficient and of not remaining simply average teachers? *For a teacher* to continue to be always an average teacher is really a low aim The needs of average teachers *should, of course, be taken into account*, but to adapt the method of teaching to the needs of average teachers is certainly to lower our aim of Sanskrit teaching If then Sanskrit questioning appears to be stereotyped or mechanical to some, it is not the fault of the method but of individual teachers, who do their work half heartedly, and fail to acquire sufficient knowledge of Sanskrit, which every Sanskrit teacher is expected to possess In short, specialists are required for teaching Sanskrit, just as specialists are required *for other subjects*

The Sanskrit teacher must, therefore, possess, in the first place, sound knowledge of Sanskrit language and literature Secondly, he must know the mother-tongue of his students, so as to be able

to seek with advantage parallelism between Sanskrit and the mother-tongue in his teaching, and to use it at times for explaining abstruse ideas. Thirdly, he must know the stock of Sanskrit vocabulary possessed by his pupils and their capacity for understanding the new 'language material'. Fourthly, he must be thoroughly acquainted with the technique of teaching which he should use as a means to the achievement of interest. Being equipped with all these qualifications he must plan in advance the lesson to be taught. In this planning he will have (i) to decide the successive steps of his lesson, (ii) to determine what material is to be supplied by 'telling' and what by questioning, (iii) to distinguish between 'teaching' questions and 'testing' questions, essential and unessential points of the lesson, and logical and psychological aspects of the 'language material'; (iv) to settle what linguistic expressions should be more stressed than others for assimilation, (v) to observe the principle of 'proportion' in drill-work and free-work, and in questioning and telling, (vi) to decide what words or expressions are to be taught by the use of direct association, translation, definition or context, (vii) to devise good application exercises and assignments for the self-study of students, and (viii) to attend to other important aspects of the lesson. In all cases he will have to adapt his teaching to the needs and capacities of his pupils and bear in mind that the quality of teaching matters more than the quantity of matter taught. After being thus fully

prepared, the Sanskrit teacher will be able to conduct his lesson well in the class

Now, in the detailed study of the lesson all the aspects as mentioned above are taken for class discussion, *which is mainly based on the text-book.* The method of using the text-book for class discussion is as follows—

" The testing purpose is entirely absent and the pupils should understand it so If the discussion is on the text-book, *books may, and probably will, be open* The activity is intended as directed, co-operative study—not as testing The teacher takes a prominent part, pointing out main divisions and important points, asking questions, giving incidentally considerable supplementary information, or re-stating and clarifying the statement of the text-book. The pupils follow in their texts by reading silently sentences or passages as directed from time to time, answering questions to show their understanding, and raising questions when they do not understand This class-period explanation-and-study method may also be intentionally adapted to the pupils' consciously acquiring *important elements in study technique* This type of discussion period may be used in connection with various other general methods, or it may be thought of as a general method of instruction to be followed from day to day as a distinctive type The class-discussion, directed by the teacher, is a common phase of the inductive-development method, and... the question-and-answer device may be used in each of the five formal steps of the

induction...Perhaps the most constant and most important phase of the discussion period is the use of questions and answers. Their use for teaching instead of testing will considerably modify the questioning technique."

—Progressive Methods of Teaching,
by Martin J. Stormzand.

We shall now see how in the class questions should be asked and explanations should be supplied according to the different stages of pupils' development. At the elementary stage, it is advisable to deviate as little from the wording of the text as possible. As the third person of nouns, pronouns and verbs predominates in descriptions and stories, it is easy to frame suitable questions on them. But as sentences in dialogues or dramatic passages mostly contain pronouns and verbs in the first two persons, there is less scope for suitable questions in them than in the passages of other types. This difficulty can be got over either by using in questions the third person for the remaining two persons or by asking the pupils to quote the actual words of a particular character in the dialogue. At the initial stage, questions may be asked almost on every word of a sentence for the purpose of fixing in the minds of pupils the function of cases (विभक्ति) and interrelations of words in that sentence. *Briskness in questioning and repetition of correct answers by pupils train them in the immediate comprehension and unconscious assimilation of language.* If text-books are pro-

-perly graded, they help this assimilation without giving the least chance for 'translation'. A small passage may suggest a large number of questions; but the teacher must have enough sense of proportion and judgment as to which words or expressions should be elicited through questions For instance, questions on the words already known by pupils may be dropped, and those on important or unknown words or expressions may be asked, so as to supply immediately their explanation. In this way it would be wise to lessen the number of questions gradually in proportion to the development of pupils' understanding. At the advanced stage, it would be more intelligent to ask questions bringing out the causal connection of different incidents in a story or the various stages of the development of a theme than base them merely on the wording of the book. It is most desirable for the teacher to frame his questions from the viewpoint of his pupils rather than that of his own, and also to rouse, in his explanation, their interest by quoting concrete examples designed to make a striking appeal to their familiar experience. Here, questions may and can be framed in the mother-tongue for eliciting the experience of pupils and for relating it to the life-situations described in lessons Such questions add to the interest of the class and make the lesson more graphic Sometimes imaginary and probable life-situations may be placed before the class as examples and pupils may be asked how they would meet those situations.

Teachers under training believing that 'telling' is a sin, are inclined to ask too many questions without supplying explanations. Again, teachers, who feel diffident of expressing themselves with ease in Sanskrit, ask mere questions or supply meagre explanation in the form of disconnected equivalents. This is how they make their own lesson mechanical! It must be remembered that too much of analysis through questions disturbs the unity of the theme and thus spoils the charm of the whole lesson. The central idea of the lesson, on which depends the organic unity of a theme, should never be lost sight of, and questioning must be made subservient to it, so as to maintain synthesis through analysis. *This synthesis is maintained as much by 'telling' as by moderate questioning.* Judicious 'telling' is, therefore, never to be under-rated, since *inspired 'telling' requires much skill,* which is inborn in some, but which can also be developed by practice. As has been shown previously, introduction of words in direct association with objects, story-telling, descriptions of situations, easy equivalents supplied to unknown words and connected explanations of sentences or paragraphs are the various forms of 'telling' usually resorted to by the teacher, as the matter in all these cases is new to the pupils. All new information should, therefore, be supplied by 'telling'. The time unnecessarily wasted in the detailed process of questioning can be saved by instantly telling the meanings of words or by presenting an idea in a few sentences. The pupils should then be asked to think over what is

told and sometimes they may be encouraged to give connected accounts of their experiences and observations. They may be given scope also for asking their own questions in the manner of the ancient Hindu students, who put comprehensive questions (परिप्रश्न) to their teachers when they were in doubt about a knotty point. After the students have thus asked their own questions, the teacher is to supply the required information by telling This 'telling', when it becomes continuous in the absence of questions by the teacher, is transformed into 'lecturing', which is suitable for the advanced stage. At the initial stage, however, too much of 'telling' or 'lecturing' bores young pupils, and hence the need in their case, for alternating 'telling' with questioning. As the pupils advance in understanding, 'telling' may be more resorted to than questioning by making repeated statements and giving detailed explanations Particularly in the teaching of literature at the advanced stage inspirational 'telling' becomes more effective than questioning. In 'telling' or giving explanations simple language suiting the capacity of pupils must be employed, and the statements of important things must be distinct, slow, clear and impressive, so that pupils would get more time for careful listening and assimilation Here, proper use of intonation, stress, pause and emotion accompanied by a few gestures conduces to bring in suitable atmosphere and interest.

Imagination of pupils can be stimulated by supplying graphic descriptions of concrete things

and by placing before their mental vision imagery or word-pictures which enable them to visualise the whole situation. Such word-pictures can be presented as concrete illustrations to abstract ideas in a passage by appealing to the experiences of pupils.

There are two kinds of 'illustrations', viz., 'material' illustrations and 'verbal' illustrations. *Material illustrations* are models of objects, pictures, diagrams etc., which should be used particularly at the initial stage, as they contain the element of 'perception' rather than that of the 'imagination'. Use of the black-board may preferably be made to draw sketches and diagrams, which can be used also at the advanced stage for clarifying inter-relations of ideas. *Verbal illustrations* appeal mainly to the imagination and can be supplied in the form of parables, legends, myths, descriptions, word-pictures, familiar expressions, allusions, etc. They are useful at the initial as well as advanced stages of pupils. The mental process involved in quoting concrete illustrations is that of comparison of things that have the element of similarity. Many times verbal illustrations with the element of similarity or identity are expressed in a literary passage itself in the form of figures of speech as उपमा (simile), उत्प्रेक्षा (poetical fancy), रूपक (metaphor) etc. These figures can be explained by a distinct mention of उपमेय (object of comparison), उपमान (standard of comparison), and सामान्य धर्म (common quality), and by showing

parallelism between उपमेय and उपमान with the help of diagrams drawn on the black-board. This method of explanation undoubtedly leads pupils to the clear understanding of ideas in a passage. For intensifying impressions of ideas 'contrast' of things having the element of 'difference' may sometimes be shown. The ideas of contrast are, at times, expressed in a literary passage itself, for bringing vividness in descriptions. The distinguishing marks of recognizing comparison and contrast are 'इव' and 'क्व–क्व' respectively in Sanskrit, and students should be made to know the definite use of those words. Of course, all these literary devices and their explanations are suitable for the advanced stage rather than for the elementary one. Mythological or scriptural allusions can also be told as illustrations for introducing 'human interest' in the lesson and for showing their cultural aspect. These allusions might appear to be digressions, but they are very useful for broadening the cultural outlook of students. Care should, however be taken to make those digressions proportionate to the central idea of the lesson and to suit them to the understanding of pupils. Quotations from Sanskrit literature containing parallel ideas may be cited, if they can be easily understood by pupils without explanation.

Over-analysis of ideas or excess of explanation should be avoided, and what is quite essential and subservient to the understanding and appreciation of the whole should be presented, so as to maintain the unity of the topic and help the assimilation of

ideas and language.* It must be remembered here that *understanding and appreciation go hand in hand and are not to be dealt with as separate aspects.* Explanations should, therefore, be such as would induce pupils to enjoy and imitate the best models placed before them. Appreciation coupled with understanding means the enjoyment and admiration of the aesthetic elements of a passage. Excellence of thought (अर्थ) and perfection of form (शब्द) are the two things to be taken into account in appreciation. The comprehensive term 'thought' includes in itself the implied sense of words (लक्ष्यार्थ), sentiments (रस), ideas with their suggestion (ध्वनि), descriptions of Nature, characterization, etc., while the term ' form ' comprises linguistic aspects, such as, style (रीति), felicity of words and phrases, rhythm, metre, etc. When the unification of all these elements into a harmonious whole dawns upon the mind, pupils are led intensely to feel literary delight or aesthetic pleasure, which is predominantly emotional rather than intellectual. This delight is experienced by pupils, when the teacher, with intrinsic interest in literature, keenly feels the beauty of a passage and exhibits his excited emotions in his effective speech. The real appreciation of a passage is possible, if the teacher enters into the spirit of his lesson or is deeply absorbed in the sentiments expressed. This mental attitude of the teacher, particularly in

* Read : इहान्वयमुखेनैव [दण्डान्वयमुखेनैव] सर्वं व्याख्यायते मया ।
नामूलं लिख्यते किञ्चिन्नानपेक्षितमुच्यते ॥ —मल्लिनाथः ।

the case of subtle emotions and suggestions, baffles his verbal expression, and is instinctively caught by students, who are then led to appreciate the niceties of the passage It is not, however, possible to appreciate all the inexplicable *subtleties of emotions and suggestions* in the class They can be fully appreciated in later life, when one recollects the situations described in the passage, and ponders over them in the light of one's own experience in similar situations These remarks apply both to the appreciation of poetry and prose, since Sanskrit literature contains a good deal of poetic prose wherein the versified form matters little, and feelings and ideas dominate. In the appreciation of all poetic literature, discussions on style (रीति), choice of words, qualities (गुण), figures of speech (अलंकार) etc, should mainly subserve *the subtle suggestion* (ध्वनि) and *heighten the predominant sentiment* (रस) Although the 'prose' in works like the पञ्चतन्त्र, हितोपदेश etc, *is comparatively* simple and lacks in high flights of imagination, yet it abounds in subtle humour suggested at several places This humour may be brought out by conducting discussions on the behaviour of several characters in the stories of those works, and human interest may thus be awakened among students even at their initial and intermediate stages

All such literary discussions can be conducted successfully, when the students are sufficiently grown-up in understanding *Many of these discussions* are suitable *for advanced* pupils in schools

and colleges. They fall flat unless students have mastered the fundamentals of the Sanskrit language, and are so much acquainted with the language as to get over, by self-help, at least a few difficulties met with. At the elementary and intermediate stages, therefore, linguistic difficulties of a passage will have to be discussed in detail, in combination, of course, with its emotional aspect and human interest. For maintaining this interest explanation will have to be given with feeling and modulation of voice, and not in a cold, prosaic or monotonous way. Simple matter may be skipped over by making short statements to connect the main thread of the topic, or simply by reading the matter in an expressive manner. It is quite essential to realize the importance of good reading, modulation of voice, and dramatization with suitable gestures as explanatory devices, which are more effective than verbal explanations.

'Verbal explanation' means the clarification, in simple language, of the inter-relations of sentences and ideas corresponding to them through the *analytico-synthetic process*. Inter-relations of words with clauses, of clauses with a larger sentence, of sentences with paragraphs, of each preceding paragraph with the succeeding one, and of paragraphs with the central idea of the whole passage are *to be explained through analysis and synthesis*. All discussions of the linguistic aspects of a passage should be conducted, as indicated above, mainly in relation to the ideas in it, so as to humanize the lesson; and recourse to synthesis or purport (तात्पर्य)

may repeatedly be had at the end of each paragraph and of the lesson, for the purpose of establishing organic unity of the whole Sometimes it is preferable to give the idea or purport (तात्पर्य)of a paragraph at the beginning of its discussion, for, when the idea of the whole is comprehended, it is possible for the pupils to gather the meanings of difficult words in their proper context and association Association and context are of great help in explaining the meanings of individual words Of course, the meanings of difficult words and phrases must be told by the teacher in the proper context Explanation of words, phrases, clauses, etc, should generally be supplied in the form of complete sentences rather than disconnected or isolated equivalents If equivalents alone are required, they should be familiar to pupils and be simpler than unknown words in the original and if no simpler Sanskrit equivalents are available, the teacher should not hesitate to give equivalents in the mother tongue In order to test whether the meanings of difficult words have been understood by pupils, the teacher should ask them to use the same words in sentences of their own

Sentences in paragraphs are simple, compound, complex or mixed Clauses in complex sentences are, of course, more closely related than those in compound ones Hence the co ordination of compound sentences and close relations of subordinate clauses with the principal one should be clearly stated Transformation of a *complex sentence* into several simple sentences is an effective explanatory

(d) Nouns in the dative case can be substituted for infinitives (तुमुन्नन्तs), e g गन्तुम्=गमनाय.

(e) Genitive and Locative Absolutes (अनादरे षष्ठी and सति सप्तमी) can be replaced by the use of यदा–तदा or यद्यपि–तथापि according to the suitable context

(f) Attention of pupils should be drawn to the independent use of यथा, यत्, चेत् and to that of यत्–तत्, यथा-तथा, यावत्–तावत्, यदि–तर्हि etc, as correlatives of each other in sentences. Their respective meanings with examples should be supplied according to their contexts

(g) Gerunds in ' अम् ' or णमुल्s can be paraphrased as follows—

(i) स्मार स्मार (वारवार स्मृत्वा) नमति, (ii) स्वादुकार (स्वादु कृत्वा) भुङ्क्ते, (iii) *नामग्राहम्* (*नाम गृहीत्वा*) आह्वयति, (iv) उदरपूर (यावदुदर पूर्यते तावत्) भुङ्क्ते, (v) पादघात (*पादेन or* पादस्य घातेन) हन्ति, उदपेषं (उदकेन) पिनष्टि, (vi) हस्तग्राहम्=हस्तेन गृहीत्वा etc , etc.

The ways indicated above are not exhaustive but merely suggestive In addition to these, certain *types of sentences, constructions, idioms or phrases* must be learnt intensively Particularly, the idiomatic use of कारक्s and particles must be explained and illustrated in the context of the text by supplying several examples of similar constructions in different contexts, and then the pupils should be led to arrive at generalization It should be borne in mind that such syntactical peculiarities are to be

elicited and explained only in 'prose' lessons and not in 'poetry' lessons, wherein pupils have to be led to visualize situations through questions and answers making sense-appeal The examples quoted in 'prose' lessons may be introduced by saying यथा at the beginning of all of them, and then they may be connected with the construction in the text by saying तथा Mere repetition of such examples helps pupils to frame the rule by themselves As oral work must precede written work according to the accepted principles of language-study, all syntactical peculiarities will first be introduced purely through oral work, and only important things may afterwards be written on the black-board If examples of a similar construction have to be cited, they should be newly composed by the teacher in simple language and on the basis of familiar experiences of pupils since examples selected from the classical literature are beyond their comprehension

Compounds in Sanskrit are a stumbling block in the understanding of students After they have been inductively taught in independent lessons, students may be made to dissolve them orally in literature lessons The teacher should, of course, help his students when unusually lengthy and difficult compounds are met with Typical compounds in a passage may be written on the black-board with their dissolutions and names It must here be borne in mind that compounds can be mastered more by constant practice in their dissolution than

by rules. In short, the linguistic aspects to be dealt with *in literature lessons are syntax and the form*, function and etymology of words. *Etymology of words* is sometimes helpful in understanding their *real meanings, yet it should not so exceed* its limit as to bore the pupils and spoil interest The most important linguistic principle that will always guide *the teacher is that the distinguishing features* of a language are learnt mainly through the imitation of varied and connected models of the best style, and that it is needless for the teacher to account for each and every form of a word or construction with the help of rules.$

Though the use of the Sanskrit medium is predominantly to be made for story-telling, questions, answers and explanations in literature lessons, it is not obligatory on every teacher to employ that medium alone in his teaching If the aim of teaching is *ultimately to facilitate understanding* or clarify meaning, it is advisable, in the interest of pupils, *occasionally to make free use of the mother-tongue* (i) for explaining syntactical peculiarities, (ii) for supplying mythological allusions and other incidental information, (iii) for quoting concrete

$ It is worth noting what Goethe says about his own way of learning Latin I had learned Latin only through practice without rule and without system I neglected the grammar as well as the rhetoric everything seemed to come naturally to me I retained the words their formations and transformations in my ear and in my mind and I employed the language with ease for writing and talking

Quoted by Jespersen How to teach a Foreign Language

by rules In short, the linguistic aspects to be dealt with in *literature lessons are syntax* and the form, function and etymology of words *Etymology of words* is sometimes helpful in understanding their real meanings, yet it should not so exceed its limit as to bore the pupils and spoil interest The most important linguistic principle that will always guide the teacher is that the distinguishing features of a *language are learnt mainly through the imitation* of varied and connected models of the best style, and that it is needless for the teacher to account for each and every form of a word or construction with the help of rules.$

Though the use of the Sanskrit medium is predominantly to be made for story-telling, questions, *answers and explanations in literature lessons*, it is not obligatory on every teacher to employ that medium alone in his teaching If the aim of teaching is ultimately to facilitate understanding or clarify meaning, it is advisable, in the interest of pupils, *occasionally to make free use of the mother-tongue* (i) for explaining syntactical peculiarities, (ii) for *supplying mythological* allusions and other incidental information, (iii) for quoting concrete

$ It is worth noting what Goethe says about his own way of learning Latin I had learned Latin only through practice without rule and without system I neglected the grammar as well as the rhetoric everything seemed to come naturally to me I retained the words their formations and transformations in my ear and in my mind and I employed the language with ease for writing and talking

Quoted by Jespersen 'How to teach a Foreign Language.'

illustrations from life, (iv) for elucidating abstract ideas, and (v) for comparing and contrasting idiomatic usages and colloquial expressions in Sanskrit with the corresponding ones in the mother-tongue. At such places free translation should be preferred to the literal one. Recourse will, however, be had to literal translation when a Sanskrit sentence might be very difficult or might contain a linguistic peculiarity. While thus making a rytional use of 'Translation,' more attention will have to be paid to the idiom of the mother-tongue, so that the translated matter would read like an original passage in the mother-tongue. The translation of a बहुव्रीहि compound, for instance, into a complete sentence is always to be preferred to the literal translation of the same. Every care must, however, be taken to see that the translation is faithful to the original Sanskrit passage, and not merely the sum and substance of it.

(g) *Recapitulation*—Thus after the detailed study of a 'literature' lesson from the viewpoint of ideas and language, the teacher should recapitulate the whole in a few sentences for creating a *synthetic impression* of the same. This recapitulation is just like the 'तात्पर्यकथन' of Shastris, who tell the purport (तात्पर्य) of the matter taught at the end of their lessons. A topic can be recapitulated by asking questions to pupils or by 'telling'. The teacher may, therefore, resort either to questions or 'telling' at his discretion. This तात्पर्य or *recapitulation is, however, useful only in 'prose' lessons.* If

it is adopted in 'poetry' lessons, it mars the poetic beauty This recapitulation of the subject-matter may be followed by a second reading of the lesson by the teacher, if necessary

III APPLICATION

After recapitulation the 'application' stage begins Here, various 'language exercises' based on the matter of the text are to be attempted by pupils as 'fixing devices' There are several exercises that are introduced at this stage The teacher may devise varied and new exercises, or according to the nature of the textual matter, the capacity of pupils and the time at his disposal he may choose any one of the following exercises —

(1) The reading of a story, etc, or dramatization of a dialogue *by pupils* is a kind of 'application exercise' calculated to fix in their minds the language of the text in its connected form At the end of a 'revision' lesson pupils may be asked to reproduce the story orally in Sanskrit If questioning has been well conducted in previous lessons, the reproduction of the story by pupils proves very successful.

(2) Words in the singular number may be changed into the plural, and *vice versa*

(3) Verbs in the present tense may be changed into the past or future and *vice versa*

(4) Words in the first person may be changed into the second or third, and *vice versa*

N. B. In exercises 2,3 and 4 it is necessary to see whether the changes made are possible and sensible according to their context. Particular Sanskrit sentences selected for changes may then be repeated with the above changes.

(5) Active constructions may be changed into passive ones, and *vice versa*. This exercise can be attempted in the case of isolated sentences.

(6) Subordinate clauses are changed into co-ordinate ones, and *vice versa*.

(7) Synthesis of sentences may be attempted by making use of यदि, यावत्, यत्, यतः, चेत् etc., or of क्त्वान्तs, ल्यबन्तs and तुमुन्नन्तs.

(8) A complex event may be separated into its component parts or a series of actions, in the manner of the 'linguistic series' given by F. Gouin in 'The Art of Teaching and Studying Languages.'

(9) Synonyms of a word as are scattered in different lessons of the text may be collected by pupils. In addition to this exercise the अमरकोश may be used for finding out other synonyms.

(10) Particular sentences may be given for 'transformation'. Pupils may be asked to express each of such sentences in as many ways as possible. Here, the Sanskrit explanation given previously by the teacher becomes helpful.

(11) Pupils may decline and conjugate important nouns and verbs in the passage studied. *In the conjugation of verbs pupils should* use suitable pronouns as subjects before verbs

(12) Pupils may collect scattered examples of the same syntactical peculiarity from various lessons Each peculiarity may be taken at a time A separate page in the note-book should be reserved by pupils for collecting sentences containing the same peculiarity In this way different pages may be devoted to different peculiarities

(13) 'Substitution tables' in Sanskrit may be constructed on the lines laid down by H E. Palmer in his '100 Substitution Tables'. Such tables may be used as application exercises.

(14) Crude forms of nouns (प्रातिपदिक) may be given, and pupils may tell their genders

(15) Pupils may fill in the gaps in sentences by using appropriate words or phrases.

(16) Pupils may use present, past, future and potential passive participles (शतृ, शानच्, क्त, क्तवतु, तव्यत्, अनीयर् etc.) for finite verbs in sentences

(17) Genitive or locative absolutes may be used in sentences containing the words यदा–तदा, यद्यपि–तथापि *etc* *Care must be taken* to see that the subject in the absolute construction is different from that in the principal sentence.

(18) Various compounds (समासs) of separate words in sentences may be formed.

(19) सन्धिs of separate words in sentences may be formed, or words joined with सन्धिs may be split.

(20) An exercise for 'translation into Sanskrit' may be given. For this purpose, sentences or a passage should be so composed in the mother-tongue that the pupils would be required to use in their Sanskrit translation the same syntactical peculiarities as already learnt by them in the text.

N. B.—All exercises are to be conducted *through the medium of Sanskrit*. Of course, for many of the above exercises the teacher should select complete sentences from the text rather than disconnected words.

CONCLUDING REMARKS—

Proper understanding of literature depends much on the knowledge of idiom and syntax, which must be explained by the teacher inductively in the context of the text. This procedure need not be supposed to be a promiscuous mixing of grammar and literature in one lesson, since syntax and idiom cannot be explained and understood except in the proper context of literature. This is why Shastris explain वाच्यs and प्रयोगs,† the syntactical parts of

† प्रयोगाः (३) कर्तृकर्मक्रियायुक्तः प्रयोगः स्यात्सकर्मकः ।
अकर्मकः कर्मयुक्तः कर्मकर्त्रो द्विकर्मकः ॥

grammar, side by side with literature rather than in an isolated manner Furthermore, *'syntax' must be distinguished from 'accidence'* (declension and conjugation) which may admit of treatment independent of the context of literature.

But unlike Shastris the followers of the Grammar-translation method in secondary schools are found to devote their time and energy more to accidence than to syntax, more to the conjugation of verbs than to the verbal derivatives, more to the second group of conjugations than to the first group, and more to the formation of nouns and verbs than to their ready-made forms While attempts are being made to popularize the study of English through the Basic Vocabulary, short-sighted Sanskrit teachers do not as yet condescend to realize the urgency of minimizing the burden of unnecessary grammatical portions and making *grammar subservient to the teaching of literature*. If Sanskrit is to be popularized, the idea of Basic Sanskrit will have to be worked out If, again, practical approach to grammar is to be made in the interest of average pupils, the irrational order

---

(b) प्रयोगा पञ्चविधा । सकर्मकोऽकर्मक कर्मणि भावे द्विकर्मकश्चेति भेदात् । सकर्मकप्रयोगो यथा—कृष्णो भक्तान् रक्षति ॥१॥ अकर्मकप्रयोगो यथा—कृष्णस्तिष्ठति ॥२॥ कर्मणि प्रयोगो यथा—विष्णुना प्रपञ्च क्रियते ॥३॥ भावे प्रयोगो यथा—कृष्णेन स्थीयते ॥४॥ द्विकर्मकप्रयोगो यथा—गो धरामन्न दुदोह ॥५॥

—समासचक्रम् ।

of grammatical portions, as above, will have to be reversed, and an appropriate measure of attention will have to be paid to syntax, verbal derivatives, formation of the first group of conjugations and the ready-made forms of regular nouns and of some verbs of the second group.

Up to this time Apte's Guide to Sanskrit Composition has been prescribed in the school course for the study of syntax; but despite the fact that it is an indispensable guide to Sanskrit teachers in the teaching of syntax, it is beyond the capacity of average pupils in respect of language, treatment and difficult examples from classical literature. Students cannot, therefore, proceed further than understand imperfectly a few first lessons of this book, and are generally left in the dark about Sanskrit syntax and idiomatic use of the language. Another mistaken policy in this respect is to divorce the teaching of syntax through this book from the regular study of literature. Sanskrit teachers may here be well advised to use this book for their own constant reference, and revive their knowledge of Sanskrit idiom and syntax. Instead of teaching this book in the class they may utilize the information contained in it for pointing out syntactical peculiarities in the proper context of literature actually studied by pupils in the class. For introducing 'Sanskrit composition' in schools and colleges on systematic lines, the latter part of this book is a valuable guide. But this part is rarely read either by teachers or by students!

short, the information in this book should be made subservient to the teaching of Sanskrit literature and composition The natural result of all the malpractice described above is that pupils are kept away from real literature, and even after the completion of their school course they are unable to tackle the meaning of a normal Sanskrit passage! The learning of Sanskrit thus defeats its own end! On the other hand, pupils taught by the 'पाठशाला' method, as the Shastris assure, are able to construe by themselves passages of normal style from the पञ्चतन्त्र or the हितोपदेश and from the रामायण and the महाभारत, after the intensive study of only *one canto* from any of the five महाकाव्यs Nay, they can attain as much proficiency in literature (व्युत्पन्नता) as a graduate can *only in four years which are ordinarily required for completing the course preliminary* to the study of शास्त्रs The point, therefore, that needs reiteration is that the teaching of syntax in the proper context of literature must receive due attention

---

SYLLABUS IN SANSKRIT

I

After observing and comparing in detail the courses in different subjects prescribed at present in various पाठशालाs and Sanskrit colleges all over India, we have been able to ascertain that the course in Literature (व्युत्पत्ति and साहित्य) is not stand-

in a broad outline, but this teaching of the लघुकौमुदी is not prevalent all over India. Many Shastris are inclined to exclude the लघुकौमुदी from the six years' course and teach the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी after the study of the पञ्चमहाकाव्यs. In any case we find that *the study of grammar 'as a science' is mostly not commenced unless pupils have studied a sufficient amount of literature.* In some parts of India (Bengal and N. India) setting aside the difficult treatment of the Paninian system in the कौमुदीs, simpler grammatical treatises like the कातन्त्र (कलाप), सारस्वत ,or मुग्धबोध are widely used, since they are specially designed for those who want to learn *grammar as a means to the study of literature* Cases, *however, are not rare* where pupils could study literature and even शास्त्रs, only with the minimum of grammatical knowledge of the ready-made forms of nouns and verbs, case-relations (कारक) and compounds (शब्दरूपावलि, धातु-रूपावलि and समासचक्र). This clearly indicates that *all Shastris were not necessarily* वैयाकरणs (specialists in grammar), even though they were proficient in Literature or other शास्त्रs, and this state of things well accounts for the existence of amusing सुभाषितs purporting the censure* of grammarians by the

* (अ) सूत्रैः पाणिनिनिर्मितैर्बहुतरैर्निष्पाद्य शब्दावलिं
वैकुण्ठस्तवमक्षमा रचयितु मिथ्याश्रमाः शाब्दिका. ॥
(आ) प्रायः काव्यैर्गमितवयस. पाणिनीयाम्बुराशेः
सारज्ञस्याप्यपरिकलितन्यायशास्त्रस्य पुस. ।
वादारम्भे वदितुमनसो वाक्यमेक सभाया
प्रह्वा जिह्वा भवति कियतीं पश्य कष्टामवस्थाम् ।

नैयायिकs and मीमांसकs, and the retort † of the वैयाकरणs* to both of them. Those who lay undue stress on the teaching of grammar in English schools should note this fact.

The different types of literature studied in the पाठशालाs are poetry, prose, drama and चम्पूs In 'poetry' five or six cantos from each of the पञ्चमहाकाव्यs (रघुवंश, कुमारसम्भव, किरातार्जुनीय, शिशुपालवध and नैषध) are studied; in 'prose' fables and romances like the हितोपदेश, पञ्चतन्त्र, दशकुमारचरित, हर्षचरित and कादम्बरी are read; in 'drama' four or five select plays are prescribed, the choice mostly falling on the वेणीसंहार, मृच्छकटिक, शाकुन्तल, उत्तररामचरित and मुद्राराक्षस; and the 'mixed types' of literature like the भारतचम्पू, विश्वगुणादर्शचम्पू, etc., which are more difficult than other types, are taught at the end. Thorough understanding of the above representatives of Classical Sanskrit is mostly coupled with appreciation, for which a standard work on poetics like the चन्द्रालोक, कुवलयानन्द, साहित्यदर्पण or काव्यप्रकाश is studied at the advanced stage. The dangers of narrow specialization are avoided in this literary course by prescribing along with literature (साहित्य) manuals (प्रकरणग्रन्थs) on the न्याय, मीमांसा and वेदान्त as the तर्कसंग्रहदीपिका or सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि, अर्थसंग्रह or आपदेवी and वेदान्तसार, वेदान्तपरिभाषा or पञ्चदशी

(*) नैयायिका वा ननु शाब्दिका वा त्रयीधियस्तु श्रमशालिनो वा।
वादाहवे बिभ्रति जैमिनीयन्यायोपरोधे सति मौनमुद्राम्॥

† शब्दशास्त्रमनधीत्य यः पुमान् वक्तुमिच्छति वचः सभान्तरे।
बन्द्धुमिच्छति वने मदोत्कटं हस्तिनं कमलनालतन्तुना॥

respectively which maintain the principles of continuity and correlation of studies, and pave the way for specialization in different शास्त्रs at the higher stage. For the first four or five years this course in literature is common to all pupils alike, and is followed by special courses in शास्त्रs for four or five years more

From the psychological point of view this course is not much faulty except in the case of proper gradation As literature prominently appeals to senses and emotions, its reading at the lower stages, as designed by the Shastris, is quite suited to the capacities of young pupils Yet attention must be paid by them to the necessity of prescribing easy books at the elementary stage and approach to more difficult works must be gradual Here, the Shastris seem to have almost ignored the reading of the रामायण and the महाभारत which have greatly influenced the whole of the later literature in its ideas and form, and the language of which is more natural, living and suited to the capacities of beginners than that of the latter *Perhaps, the Shastris do not think it desirable to* place before their pupils the language of the great epics, as it deviates from the rules of पाणिनि at some places Such deviations, however, not being rare even in the literature written after पाणिनि, there is no adequate reason why selections from the रामायण and the महाभारत should not be studied in the beginning, before the study of the पञ्चमहाकाव्यs Again, in a few cases, the early beginning of the study of

difficulties solved by self-help. In the teaching of literature clear understanding of the texts is more aimed at than the synthetic appreciation of their poetic beauty. *Complete memorizing* and *repeated revision* of the books prescribed are the only methods of study adopted by students. Thus the methods of study and teaching are predominantly *intensive,* though the comparative, critical and historical methods of extensive study are conspicuous by their absence. We must, therefore, admit that there are in the Shastri method a few flaws which will have to be removed for the purpose of making it suit the present conditions. But its merits in other respects, as mentioned above, far outweigh its demerits; *and in spite of its flaws it is far superior* to the methods of teaching Sanskrit as employed in English schools and colleges. Of course, taking into account the modest position of Sanskrit in the University curriculum, we think that the merits of the Shastri methods can be retained with advantage even in English schools and colleges. The Sanskrit books prescribed for the University examinations are almost the same as mentioned above; yet reform in the methods of teaching *Sanskrit is a desideratum.*

II

Improvements are, therefore, suggested here in *the Sanskrit syllabus for high schools,* so as to enable intelligent as well as average pupils to receive the maximum of the benefit of their study of Sanskrit. *Up to the Matriculation Examination the*

course should be common to all types of pupils alike, and the standard of Sanskrit to be attained by them should be the understanding, with the help of a Sanskrit Dictionary alone, of the type of *Sanskrit prose* contained in the हितोपदेश, पञ्चतन्त्र and a few simpler portions of the दशकुमारचरित and कादम्बरी, of *Sanskrit verse* in the महाभारत, रामायण, नीतिशतक, and a canto from the रघुवंश, and of a *drama* of भास. All efforts in schools should, therefore, be concentrated on developing gradually the practice of pupils in construing and understanding themselves passages from literature with the thorough knowledge of as much grammar as is required for understanding literature

GRAMMAR

The most essential grammatical portions to be mastered are—the declension of regular nouns and pronouns, conjugation in frequent tenses and moods of the verbs of the First Group (1st, 4th, 6th and 10th conjugations) in detail, and of the Second Group in a broad outline, Compounds, case-usages (कारक) and a few verbal and nominal derivatives *

---

* It is worthy of note what Lok Tilak, the great Sanskrit scholar, writes in a letter addressed to the teacher of his sons about the teaching of Sanskrit, particularly Sanskrit Grammar—

Instead of taking the boys to learn dry rules or difficult portions e g frequentative or desiderative, etc confine to ordinary declensions and simple tenses—like the present, past and futures imperative and potential The knowledge of other portions may be more or less accurate but those

This grammar should generally be taught on inductive lines, the deductive method being resorted to in a few inevitable cases (viz, numerals, declension of nouns ending in consonants, and some conjugations of the second group), where there is an ultimate saving of time and energy The thorough learning of the *ready-made forms* of nouns in the शब्दरूपावलि may be recommended, since it is the most effective and time-honoured way of learning necessary grammar In the learning of similar grammatical forms, use of analogy (in the forms of words) may advantageously be made *More stress should be laid on the teaching of case-usages (कारक), compounds and syntax than on that of verbs and their formation with the help of rules* We must remember here that Sanskrit literature is distinguished for its Nominal rather than for the Verbal Style *It is, therefore, necessary to*

---

indicated above should be thorough and accurate so that a student should find no hesitation in answering any question in them A few rules of कारक (cases Govt) should be added from Apte s Guide or the Kaumudi Along with these, I would continue the reading of Hitopadesh-not continuous-but selected portions and learning by heart the important verses therein which improves Sanskrit composition Care should be taken that whatever the boys know, they know it thoroughly and definitely It matters not if they omit the complicated portions of Grammar but they must be able to thoroughly answer the *ordinary questions.*

—लो. टिळक याच्या आठवणी व आख्यायिका, खंड २ रा, पृ. २०६–२०९.

economize the labour of the detailed teaching of verbs Frequent conjugations, tenses, moods, verbal derivatives (present, past, future and potential participles) and nominal derivatives with important nominal suffixes may be taught inductively in the proper context of literature, using discretion in differentiating forms for recognition from those for formation. In the examination papers, questions on grammar should consist of exercises in syntax, i e , exercises in substitution, synthesis, transformation, change of voice and use of grammatical forms in *sentences* rather than the isolated forms of words

Here those, who object to the learning of ready-made grammatical forms and favour the teaching of their detailed formations with the help of rules, assert that training the pupils in the habit of accounting for the grammatical forms of words met with in the language, awakens thought in them and thus has a high educational value From the logical point of view all this is well and good only in the case of intelligent and advanced students, but psychological considerations hardly allow us to agree with these people As modern psychology propounds, the treatment of a subject in the case of beginners or young pupils must be psychological rather than logical, if it should awaken intrinsic interest in the subject and love for it Undoubtedly, awakening of thought among pupils must always be kept in view by a teacher, yet it ought to be an end rather than a means. Every conscientious teacher

attending to the instincts, individual differences and needs of pupils must bear in mind that thought can be awakened gradually and not prematurely. Although the purely deductive method of teaching the grammatical formation of words might be the only scientific method from the adult point of view, long experience has sufficiently proved it to be laborious and disgusting in the eyes of young pupils. Of course, the learning of readymade grammatical forms is much less laborious and more economical than the formation of words with the help of rules Again, in the teaching of grammar, the empiric method, which proceeds from the particular to the general, from the concrete to the abstract, or from examples to the rule, and which, if properly organized, develops into the 'Inductive Method', is not only far from being unscientific, but it positively conduces to the pupils' interest, better understanding and gradual awakening of thought

We are at a loss to understand why the learning of ready-made forms in the रूपावलि, the speedy means of learning Sanskrit, should be so much disfavoured by some If it be supposed that the repetition of words in the रूपावलि is mechanical, the same charge can be laid upon abstract grammatical rules which the pupils learn by heart with little understanding According to the modern principles of language-study a language can be better learnt by use and intelligent repetition than by rules If this principle is translated into practice, there should be no objection to the learning of ready-

made forms in the रूपावलि. We aver that reputed Shastris are in perfect agreement with us on this point, and that the शब्दरूपावलि can very well serve the need of those pupils who want to be early introduced to Sanskrit literature Moreover, old manuscripts of शब्दरूपावलिs belonging to the beginning of the 17th centry A D, are extant and testify to the fact that the practice of teaching ready made forms of nouns is current among us at least for three hundred years Again, it is heard that there are Jain manuscripts of शब्दरूपावलिs and धातुरूपावलिs, which are still older than those mentioned above It may, therefore, be concluded that this practice might not have continued for so long a period, unless it had been of utility and advantage It may be suggested in passing that while learning by heart the शब्दरूपावलि, irregular nouns of rare occurrence may safely be dropped

Some people being led by philological and etymological considerations and influenced by यास्क's principle that nouns in the language are derived from roots, lay undue stress on the teaching of verbs in the 'school course' But what is the good of carrying average pupils, who want something humanistic rather than formal, through the meandering and bewildering process of the detailed formation of verbs? To enable pupils to account for verbal forms in the light of rules, so as to encourage thought, might possess a high educational value in the opinion of some people, but this is a process involving ratiocination and is suitable only for the

pupils that have reached the conceptual level We must here admit that some tenses and moods are simpler and more useful than others Yet it is advisable, for all practical purposes, to observe a clear distinction between detailed formation and recognition, and to acquire mastery over important portions For instance, the Second Group of Conjugations, Perfect (third person only), Aorist, etc, should be reserved for recognition only, as they are found difficult by average pupils If, however, the claims of etymology as furthering the cause of the mother-tongue be strongly put forth, the following compromise may be effected

As the roots of the First Group of Conjugations far outnumber those of the Second Group and are more frequent in literature, they are more important than the latter $ The verbs of the 'second group' may be broadly learnt for recognition, yet for some of the verbs of that group, verbs of the

$ According to the धातुपाठ of पाणिनि the number of roots in each of the two groups is as follows —

First Group		Second Group	
Conj	No	Conj	No
1	1035	2	72
4	140	3	24
6	156	5	35
10	410	7	25
		8	10
	1741	9	61
			227

Thus the total number of roots in the Sanskrit language is 1968

'*first group*' having the same meaning may be used by pupils in their composition. For all these reasons *the formation of the verbs of the First Group, which is also comparatively easy, may be* advantageously taught in four or five lessons with the help of rules, so as to give pupils the idea that many *words* in Sanskrit and तद्भव *words* in the mother-tongue can be derived from Sanskrit roots. It may incidentally be remarked here that the 'first group' of conjugations can be taught inductively and in a manner more simplified, organized and synthetic than in that adopted at present. This teaching of the '*first group*' will further prepare ground for the teaching of verbal derivatives, which are more important and frequent in Sanskrit than *the actual forms of finite verbs*. The knowledge of the verbal derivatives of the 'first group' will stand pupils in good stead while forming, from the roots of the '*second group*', participles, which may preferably and idiomatically be used by average pupils for the finite verbs of the same. This is one of the reasons why the '*second group*' of conjugations should be prescribed for recognition only. Thus the knowledge of the 'first group' of conjugations might, no doubt, help one to carry on the etymological study of the mother-tongue. Yet, so much etymological aspect to the teaching of grammar is quite sufficient in schools, and intelligent students, if they have any aptitude for etymology or philology, might give it free scope in their 'college course' as well as in later life. But in the case of average pupils, who generally do

not want to bother themselves about this kind of work, the learning of ready-made forms in the धातुरूपावलि may be recommended without hesitation. Nobody can expect, even if he wishes, all pupils to turn out philologists under the present system Why should then the majority of pupils, who are in need of the flesh and blood of ideas in literature be ridden to it, without any distinction, and be forced against their will to rest satisfied with the dry bones of formal grammar ? If the whole school course in Sanskṛt be framed with the view of developing the tendency of pupils to analyse words and derive them from their root-stems, it is bound to be rigid and tiresome, and the pupils in that measure, being kept away from the reading of literature, are naturally inclined to bid farewell to Sanskṛt Language-learning in the school course, at least, should be synthetic rather than analytic, if it should be interesting and really beneficial

In order to give a definite idea of what has been said above in general about the teaching of grammar and to enable one to ascertain what portions are quite necessary for the understanding of literature, it is proposed here to set down in a graded manner fixed grammatical portions to be finished in each standard Though the portion prescribed for Std. III is very small, the procedure to be followed in it is purposely described in detail, so as to remove vagueness as to how one should proceed at the beginner's stage. In the case of the conjugation of the 'second group' and the declension of irregular words, actual lists of important roots and

words, whose ready-made forms should be learnt, are given Those roots and words are quite sufficient for all practical purposes Stress on those roots and irregular words and on the third person of the Perfect will, it is hoped, relieve pupils of the drudgery and tedium of learning unessential things The other more important or less important portions are indicated at their proper places The portions of grammar to be done in each standard are as follows—

STANDARD III

In order to create a proper attitude towards the subject and to supply a systematic basis for its learning, it is advisable to begin Sanskrit in Std III of High Schools The teaching of Sanskrit should start with complete sentences in conversational lessons on familiar topics, through which the pupils will be acquainted with the structure of a Sanskrit sentence For this purpose nouns, pronouns, adjectives, verbs and indeclinables of frequent occurrence will be used gradually as parts of sentences for conversation The inflexional nature of Sanskrit will be made known by introducing in sentences the forms of words in all विभक्ति in a graded way and by making clear their कारक–relation through actions The कारक–relation will be the most important fact to be impressed on the minds of pupils and the ready-made forms of 'action'-verbs in the present tense will occupy a modest position in a sentence so as to subserve the कारक–relation. Thus the idea of the

tongue may be contrasted with those in Sanskrit. Numerals from *one* to *ten* can be taught by actually *counting things. Forms of* एक, द्वि, त्रि, चतुर् *in the* nominative case and all genders can be used in conversational lessons and easily learnt. Declension of these in the other विभक्ति is unnecessary. Adjectives may be taught in association with words like कीदृश, कथम्भूत, etc

(d) *Verbs*—As verbs denoting physical actions can be taught by actually performing actions, they may first be introduced. Distinguishing features of different conjugations need not be observed at this stage. The present tense and imperative mood (2nd person only) of the ready-made forms of such verbs may be introduced so *as to give a broad idea* of verbs. Such verbs may be conjugated by analogy, *without entering into the details of formation.* The forms of कृ (present tense and imperative mood) may be used along with the forms of किम् in questions asked to elicit verbs.

(e) *Indeclinables*— The most common ones should be used in lessons. Concrete adverbs can be taught by performing actions and by modulation of voice in conversation. They *may again* be *taught* in association with कदा, कुत्र, कथम्, किमर्थम्, कुतः etc.

From this grammatical scheme of conversational lessons it need not be supposed that the course for the third standard would be made too much grammatical. *In this scheme the formation* of verbs has no place. The verb in its ready-made form will occupy in a sentence the modest position

of subserving the कारक-relation of several words which are of different parts of speech. It will, therefore, be found that in a Sanskrit sentence inflected words other than the verb—particularly the subject and the object—will hold a prominent position. For understanding those words and their relations nothing more is required than the simpler aspects of the grammar of the mother-tongue, viz., the knowledge of different parts of speech, विभक्ति, gender, number and person. Pupils beginning to learn Sanskrit must be presumed to possess at least this much knowledge of the grammar of their mother-tongue. Thus the grammatical scheme set forth here is mainly based upon the fundamentals of the grammar of the mother-tongue. Unless it is ascertained that pupils possess this minimum of the vernacular grammar, Sanskrit cannot be begun well. The grammatical scheme given above is, therefore, not at all beyond the capacity of pupils. What the beginners in Sanskrit have here to do, after the conversational lessons are finished, is simply to classify, tabulate and learn by heart, according to विभक्ति and वचन, the forms of words already drilled in lessons. This slight grammatical, or rather syntactical, aspect will prepare a good grounding for the study of Sanskrit. Moreover, all the forms of किम् and other interrogative words being introduced in conversation, will acquaint the pupils, from the very beginning, with the typical question-forms in Sanskrit. *Those question-forms are, according to the* दण्डान्वयपद्धति, *indispensa-*

ble to the methodical development of 'literature' lessons through the medium of Sanskrit, and if they are introduced from the beginning, pupils, instead of giving mechanically Sanskrit answers to Sanskrit questions, will give them with understanding and intelligence. As the beginner's stage in the study of Sanskrit is so very important, things to be taught in Std III have been given here in detail.

STANDARD IV

(a) Declension of regular nouns and adjectives ending in vowels, of the pronouns अस्मद्, युष्मद्, अदस्, and इदम्, and of the first five numerals—The शब्दरूपावलि may be freely used for learning the ready-made forms of all of them.

(b) Conjugation of roots of the 'first group' (1st, 4th, 6th and 10th गणs-both the पदs) in the present and past (अनद्यतनभूत) tenses, and in the imperative and potential moods.—This may be taught in detail with the help of rules on inductive lines. The first and the sixth गणs may be taught together for comparison and contrast. Forms of other roots of the same गणs *may be learnt from the* धातुरूपावलि

(c) The passive voice and उपसर्गs may be taught just after the teaching of the present tense in both the पदs.

(d) *Past passive participles (with* त*), indeclinable participles* (with त्वा, य, तुम्)—Past passive participles may be introduced after the teaching of अनद्यतनभूत. After broadly knowing the rules for their

formation, their ready-made forms may be learnt from the धातुरूपावलि.

(e) स्वरसन्धिs, विसर्गसन्धिs and a few व्यञ्जनसन्धिs, change of न् to ण्.—सन्धिs may be begun after the pupils have been able to recognize readily the forms of nouns, verbs and कृदन्तs, since the knowledge of the grammatical forms of words is quite essential to the splitting of सन्धिs. Examples of सन्धिs may be selected from the 'reader' and rules may be derived inductively from them. It must be remembered here that the knowledge of सन्धिs is required more for splitting than for making them. Moreover, सन्धिs are optional in a Sanskrit sentence.*

STANDARD V

(a) Declension of nouns ending in consonants, and of numerals from 5 to 20 —Formation of व्यञ्जनान्त nouns may be taught in a broad outline with the help of व्यञ्जनसन्धिs. After this the ready-made forms of व्यञ्जनान्त nouns may be learnt from the शब्दरूपावलि.

(b) Conjugation of roots of the 'second group' (2nd, 3rd, 5th, 7th, 8th and 9th गणs).—In the case of all these गणs except the second, formation may optionally be taught; but it may be taught *in a broad outline*, assigning one lesson to each गण. In the case of the 2nd गण, however, no formation should be taught, as it involves many intricacies

* संहितैकपदे नित्या नित्या धातूपसर्गयोः ।
नित्या समासे वाक्ये तु सा विवक्षामपेक्षते ॥

baffling the pupils. It may be said in general that *the ready-made forms of only the following common* roots of the second group may be learnt by pupils from the धातुरूपावलि.

2nd गण–अद्, अस्, आस्, अधि + इ, जागृ, दुह्, ब्रू, विद्, शास्, शी, स्तु and हन्.

3rd गण–दा, भी, भृ and हा.

5th गण–आप्, चि, शक्, and श्रु.

7th गण–छिद्, भुज्, युज्, and रुध्.

8th गण–कृ and तन्.

9th गण–क्री, ग्रह्, ज्ञा and बन्ध्.

N B—The number of these roots may be lessened by dropping those for which roots of the Ist group, having the same meaning, can be used

(c) Past active participles, present participles and potential passive participles.

(d) द्वन्द्व and तत्पुरुष compounds, use of तर and तम.

(e) Examples of the idiomatic use of विभक्ति, as they occur in literature, may be collected and their rules may be inductively framed A small beginning should be made in this respect.

STANDARD VI

(a) *Declension of only the following irregular* words—पति, सखि, भू, धी, स्त्री, सेनानी, गो, नौ, दुह्, पूषन्, युवन्, पथिन्, विद्वस्, प्राञ्च्, राज्, जाग्रत्, पुंस्, गिर्, अप्, and अहन्.

Ready-made forms of these words may be learnt from the शब्दरूपावलि.

(b) सेट्–अनिट्–वेट् (a broad idea may be given; कारिकाs regarding them *need not be learnt*), *first*

future (a broad idea should be given); second future and conditional; perfect or परोक्षभूत (only the third person should be taught, as the remaining two persons are of rare occurrence in literature); important causals.

(c) कर्मधारय, द्विगु, बहुव्रीहि and अव्ययीभाव compounds.

(d) Perfect and future participles; other important numerals (particularly, every tenth one); use of ईयस्–इष्ठ and तरप्–तमप्.

(e) Idiomatic use of विभक्ति should be taught as before in the context of literature.

STANDARD VII

(a) Aorist (सामान्यभूत), desiderative, denominative, benedictive and frequentative forms (all for recognition only).

(b) Common तद्धित affixes and feminine bases.

(c) Idiomatic use of विभक्ति and particles, and other important aspects of syntax. These should be taught in the context of literature as before.

N. B.—It must be noted here that *all 'grammar' lessons* are to be conducted *through the medium of the mother-tongue.*

LITERATURE

In the teaching of literature, use of Sanskrit questions and Sanskrit explanation, in the manner of Sanskrit commentaries following the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, should be made, the mother-tongue being, of course, freely used for explaining abstruse ideas or linguistically difficult portions, and for the teaching of grammar. Students' comprehension of Sanskrit texts may be tested in the examination by

them partially to translate into the mother-tongue and partially to paraphrase in Sanskrit like the Sanskrit commentaries (at the advanced stage only).

MEMORIZING

Good and loud reading of connected passages from literature should be encouraged from the beginning, and *select passages from literature should be got learnt by heart*, so that assimilation of language, would be facilitated and vocabulary be fixed It must be remembered here that for acquiring command over a language the *intelligent memorizing or ' learning by heart ' of select passages (prose and poetry) from literature is one of the best means* * The present educational policy of discouraging any kind of memorizing is certainly not wise Although unintelligent memorizing may be discouraged, there is no plausible reason why intelligent memorizing may not be resorted to as a method of study *In this case, students must be led* to know what things should be learnt by heart. They may be encouraged to memorize connected passages rather than disconnected, lengthy word-lists The mastery of Sanskrit can be acquired more easily by this intelligent memorizing than by ' Translation into Sanskrit ', which is an up-hill task for a majority of pupils

* It is worthy of note what I tsing, a Chinese traveller of the 7th century A D, says about the Indian method of memorizing—

' In India there are two traditional ways by which one can attain to great intellectual power. Firstly, by repeatedly

TRANSLATION INTO SANSKRIT

This translation, which is rarely attempted in the examination by pupils for want of sufficient knowledge of Sanskrit vocabulary, idiom and syntax, which results in the mechanical process of putting word for word, and which did not at all find its place in the Shastri method, should be dropped. If the University, with the purpose of testing the students' knowledge of Sanskrit, still requires them to translate into Sanskrit, this translation should not be taught until the pupils have mastered a sufficient amount of Sanskrit vocabulary and syntax. It should be taught only during the last two years of the school stage on the following approved lines —

In the beginning, an original and connected Sanskrit passage suiting the capacity of pupils may be translated by the teacher into the mother-tongue or English and may be given for re-translation into Sanskrit. The pupils may read this English or vernacular passage silently once or twice for catching its general drift. Two or three questions in Sanskrit may be asked by the teacher to prepare ground and ascertain whether the pupils have

---

committing to memory the intellect is developed, secondly the alphabet fixes one's ideas. By this way, after a practice of ten days or a month, a student feels his thoughts rise like a fountain, and can commit to memory whatever he has once heard [not requiring to be told twice]. This is far from being a myth, for I myself have met such men."

— A Record of the Buddhist Religion.

understood the general drift. Pupils may then be asked to translate the passage mentally for a short time; and while they are doing so, a few Sanskrit equivalents or phrases may be supplied by the teacher at the places where the pupils cannot use proper expressions. Here, the difficulties of pupils must be anticipated by the teacher and solved then and there. After this mental translation the pupils may be led to make a co-operative effort to translate the passage orally. The teacher should now guide the pupils and conduct detailed oral discussion in the mother-tongue on various aspects. Each sentence will now be attempted in the light of the general sense. This oral discussion would comprise the use of particular idioms and compounds, synthesis of clauses, various ways of expressing the same idea, use of participles, particles, passive voice, the locative or genitive absolutes, etc. In this way all important aspects of Sanskrit syntax may be discussed in the class. This oral discussion will be followed by the writing of translation in a connected form by pupils under the supervision of the teacher. Or the teacher should write the translation on the black-board, the pupils supplying sentences of their own one after another. After the translation of the whole passage is finished, the teacher should present the original Sanskrit passage for comparison. In this comparison better expressions of the original will be noted by pupils. Thus two or three periods may be devoted to the translation of each passage. A few such exercises would give pupils insight into the art of translation.

It would be better if the teacher would in the beginning select for re-translation a Sanskrit passage already studied by pupils in the text. This would induce pupils to assimilate the language of the text. After sufficient practice in this retranslation, independent passages in the mother-tongue or English may be given for translation into Sanskrit. Here also oral discussion will play an important part as before

SANSKRIT COMPOSITION

In the place of Translation into Sanskrit, Sanskrit *composition*, imitative of the textual language and helping its proper assimilation should be beneficially introduced in schools This composition in the school stage should be of the nature of exercises reproductive of the passages studied in the text and should mainly consist of descriptions, stories, summaries and expansion of ideas in सुभाषित in a graded form Use of Sanskrit questions should amply be made for the oral development of the theme, and several pupils should be made to repeat correct answers so as to facilitate their 'written' composition, which would naturally follow detailed oral discussion At the elementary stage suitable pictures may be used as aids to the oral development of the theme In colleges free or original composition may be attempted People who have never tried such exercises, can have no idea as to how it is simpler than Translation into Sanskrit, more conducive to the learning of idiomatic language, and a sure test of the pupil's knowledge of

Sanskrit Of course, in examinations, answers to questions on composition will have to be written in Sanskrit Even if we suppose that students will, as usual cram such Sanskrit material ready-made from their examination guides, it will ultimately be beneficial and not harmful, since they will learn by heart so much of connected Sankrit matter

Reform in the Sanskrit syllabus for schools should thus be effected so that intelligent and average students would, both profit by it, would retain the knowledge of Sanskrit though limited, as the surrender value of their school course and would use that knowledge for advanced study at home or in colleges

III

Here some enthusiasts assert that the teaching of Sanskrit up to the Matriculation Examination will have thus to be adapted to the needs of average pupils and hence this low standard of the knowledge of Sanskrit will be detrimental to the produc tion of great Sanskrit scholars with genuine Classical spark' They further add that this low standard of Sanskrit will be quite inadequate to the higher Sanskrit studies to be continued in colleges

The upholders of this view, being taught Sans krit by the Grammar-translation Method, which is now out of date in Europe are generally ignorant of the efficacy of the Shastri method even under changing conditions They, moreover, profess to maintain progressive spirit by advocating the his torical, critical and comparative methods or the

scientific Western methods of research in the higher Sanskrit studies. They, however, are so conservative in their attitude towards the methods of juvenile teaching, that they betray their ignorance of the natural and psychological methods of teaching *classical languages, as recently developed in* Europe! They are further found to emphasize the use of the English medium in Sanskrit studies! *It is inconceivable, under these circumstances, how* great Sanskrit scholars with genuine 'classical spark' are to be produced, when the predominance *of the English medium is still to be continued at* the sacrifice of the intensive study of original Sanskrit works!

Really, the standard of Sanskrit set up above in the syllabus for the Matriculation Examination need not be considered low, if a matriculate, who has undergone that course, would be able to understand by self-help verses from the रामायण and महाभारत, or prose passages of the type of the पञ्चतन्त्र, हितोपदेश, etc. If this level would really be reached, it would be a sound preparation for the higher study of Sanskrit in the college stage. To be true to facts we cannot help remarking that even this level is not reached by the matriculates of the present day, more time being devoted to obscurities in grammar than to the practice of reading and understanding literature. This undue stress on unnecessary grammatical portions dissipates the energy of pupils in attending to non-essential things, obstructs them from mastering even the minimum of the

essential portions of grammar, and keeps them ignorant of even the basic facts ! People, who have no perspective of the things that can and must be known in the school stage, who do not take into account the secondary place and short time allotted to Sanskrit, who have no definite idea of the standard of Sanskrit to be reached in the school course, and who have vague notions about the aim of Sanskrit teaching and the chief points to be more stressed than others for achieving that aim, are bound to take a low view of the syllabus given above. But, if definite views about the problem of Sanskrit teaching ought to be formed, a definite standard of Sanskrit to be reached in the school stage ought to be set up, and thoughtful persons will, of course, agree to our proposed syllabus It is futile to set up, only in imagination, a high standard, which has never been reached nor can be reached in actuality by average students, and it is certainly criminal to concentrate one's energy only upon intelligent students at the expense of so many average ones, the 'surrender value' of whose study of Sanskrit is negligible under the present circumstances. The *Problem of Sanskrit Teaching is concerned more with average pupils than with intelligent ones, and we here seek to popularize the study of Sanskrit by searching for more interesting, more intensive and more economical ways and means of learning it within the allotted period* If need be, individual study or special coaching may be resorted to by intelligent students desiring to be

specialists. But in schools as well as in colleges methods of 'group teaching' being more important than those of individual study, it is highly imperative under the existing order to adopt the former ones for supplying the needs of average students. If the aforesaid standard of Sanskrit will be actually reached by average pupils along with intelligent ones, then and then only the aim of Sanskrit teaching in the school stage will have been achieved. The mistake usually committed in setting up a high standard is that of generalizing from the specialist's point of view about average students also, and of presuming what is easy for intelligent students to be equally so for average ones. This mistake is the sole cause of making Sanskrit a detested and unpopular subject.

We shall, however, set aside the case of so many average students, who somehow pass their Matriculation Examination without developing their power to understand a normal Sanskrit passage in prose or verse and discontinue their higher education, being destitute of the joy of Sanskrit literature. We shall now see how higher Sanskrit studies are conducted in Colleges. The Indian Universities resting mostly on the European methods of extensive study have given undue prominence, as indicated above, to the medium of English in Sanskrit studies, though in the school stage the mother-tongue can now be used as the medium of instruction. It is no use denying the fact that this foreign medium has given a serious set-back to

real Sanskrit scholarship or to higher Sanskrit studies $In order to meet the University requirements Sanskrit text-books with English notes, English translations and' English introductions are being supplied in plenty, with the inevitable result that students acquit themselves well in the University examinations by simply reading this English material to the exclusion of the study of original texts. Even if we suppose that Sanskrit texts are read, the attention of students is directed more to the sum and substance than to the detailed study of the original Thus the intensive study of Sanskrit texts being thrown overboard, sense for the subtle suggestion and beauty of Sanskrit expression is rarely *developed among students* *Needless to add here* that Sanskrit commentaries, which many times illuminate one on important points and help one to enter into the spirit of the original, are rarely read Why should *partial use of the Sanskrit medium* be not made in Arts Colleges for the explanation of Sanskrit Texts, so as to encourage the

$ 'In this [British] system of education the place of prominence is naturally assigned to the study of English Literature and of European Science and Philosophy, the medium of instruction for which was English Indian Classical languages and Indian Vernaculars were admitted only to a *secondary place in the curriculum and as* the *medium* of instruction even for these Indian languages was *required to be English* *It is easily conceivable that not much progress* in the higher Sanskritic studies was normally possible under the system '

— Dr S K Belvalkar–Poona Sanskrit College Prospectus.

study of Sanskrit commentaries among students ?' Those who know the psychological principle that oral use of a language makes for its unconscious assimilation and develops a proper attitude of students towards learning it, and those who have witnessed some reputed Pandits effectively using the Sanskrit medium in Arts Colleges, will realize the importance of this point. But in the eyes of many educated people, to use the Sanskrit medium for Sanskrit teaching even in the higher studies is 'to flog a dead horse'!

In the Sanskrit examinations of the University those who know English more than Sanskrit are found to gain an advantage over those who know Sanskrit more than English. Students are generally expected to know *external facts* about a text book rather than *the text* itself. Loud and good reading in Sanskrit is scarcely attended to from the lowest to the highest stage; and it is only occasionally that one comes across even University graduates who can read aloud a Sanskrit passage with confidence, flawless pronunciation and fluency. There is very little scope for original Sanskrit composition, and the translation of unseen passages in examination papers, if it can be called 'composition' at all, is rarely attempted by a majority of students thinking it to be a hard nut to crack.

*recently prescribed three प्रकरण*s *from the* सिद्धान्त-कौमुदी, viz, संज्ञा, परिभाषा and कारक for the B A (Hons) Examination As the कारकप्रकरण is very useful for the intelligent reading of Sanskrit literature and for correct Sanskrit composition, there is much propriety in prescribing it There is also propriety in prescribing the संज्ञाप्रकरण, as it serves the purpose of an introduction to the whole grammatical science, though it contains a few सूत्र*s*, the full implications of which cannot be understood by students, unless they have read the major portion of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी. But there is no propriety in prescribing the परिभाषाप्रकरण, for the understanding of which many सूत्रs from the portion not prescribed have to be quoted with examples, and even though such unknown सूत्रs are quoted and explained in detail, it is natural for the students not to understand them perfectly and be somewhat bewildered. परिभाषाs are the rules of interpretation having a wider application to many unknown सूत्रs It can, therefore, be affirmed that they cannot be clearly comprehended, unless the students have gone through the major portion of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी. This point ought to have been considered well before the परिभाषाप्रकरण was prescribed Moreover, in prescribing nothing of grammar during the first two years of college education and in abruptly prescribing three प्रकरणs from the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी for the B A Examination, there is no gradation or continuity of any kind We think that students would be more benefited, if the

लघुकौमुदी or the मध्यकौमुदी would be prescribed continuously from the beginning of the college course up to the B A Examination, and would be finished by instalments in four years. Of course, परिभाषाs occur in the लघुकौमुदी or मध्यकौमुदी also, yet they can be studied there in the proper context of the सूत्रs to which they apply Hence the students are expected to understand them at their proper places

From all that has been said above it will be found that the study of grammar is, on the whole, neglected in the college course It is not then astonishing that many students are not found to possess an accurate knowledge of the structure and idiom of the Sanskrit language Thus the University graduates can supply a fund of information about Sanskrit literature, even though they have a little knowledge of Sanskrit itself ! A strange convention has been established at the university examinations that answers to all questions except the one for 'Translation into Sanskrit' have to be written in English ! Why should students be not expected to answer a few questions in Sanskrit composition and not asked to write their own Sanskrit commentary on the portions in the text, in imitation of reputed commentators ? Why should thus the study of Sanskrit commentaries along with original texts be not encouraged to raise the standard of real Sanskrit scholarship? But without fully judging how Sanskrit composition is easier than 'Translation into Sanskrit,' and how the Sanskrit medium is more natural, congenial and akin to the mother-tongue than

English, every such reform in Sanskrit teaching is thought to be ambitious and unnatural

At the beginning the intentions of the Indian Universities in framing the higher Sanskrit courses were to train students in the Western methods of extensive study,* otherwise named-"the critical, historical and comparative methods" The students were expected to apply those methods to Oriental learning and become research scholars It must be remembered here that the number of such scholars is bound to be very small, and that the majority of students are more interested in the appreciation of the beauties of Sanskrit literature than in research work The date and history of a particular author, the sources and literary merits of his work, the relative place and value of that author in the whole literature, the propriety of various readings in the text, the discrimination between the true and false statements of that author, the comparison of the views of different authors, and the interpretations supplied by different commentators—are the chief topics of study, on which questions are usually asked at the university examinations There is nothing to find fault with them except the fact that undue importance is attached to them in examinations and that the details of those topics are supplied in colleges through ready-made English notes without doing full justice to the Sanskrit texts This is principally the training in methods rather than the learning of the language and the subject-matter of text-books. Even in the case of the subject matter, students aer

more acquainted with the views and interpretations of Western scholars than with the traditional Hindu outlook, which is generally discarded as narrow and irrational. Judicious use of the views and criticism of Western scholars must, of course, be made to keep oneself abreast of them and to have a wider outlook of things. But as the case stands, it seems that the detailed and exact knowledge of Sanskrit, as is possessed by the Shastris, is not supposed to be necessary for carrying on chronological researches in Sanskrit literature. The research scholars who are more equipped with the historical, critical and comparative outlook of things than with the Sanskrit language judge what Shastric works or authors of a particular period would be useful for their research *in a particular branch, and the* Shastris are asked to explain the definite portions of those works, calculated to be important, to the research scholars, who afterwards build their edifice on all the facts collected. This tendency is, perhaps, due to the importance attached more to the chronology of Sanskrit literature than to the other aspects of its study in the first three or four decades of Oriental research. The *natural result of this undue stress on the Western methods of extensive study is the negligence of the Oriental methods of intensive study.* This fact leads the research scholars to seek the substantial help of the Hindu Pandits, whose intensive study of original Sanskrit works ever enables them to elucidate the niceties of original texts. But for the aid of

Shastris $ it would almost be impossible for the *research scholars to understand difficult* Sanskrit texts and to collect the raw material or data of their research work, which passes for 'original work' simply on account of the English medium employed It is however, a great pity that the humble Shastris are rarely credited with this research work, only because they are usually taken to be bigoted, *ignorant of modern critical methods* and *hence* unable to reach generalizations of wider application The modern research scholars thus get wide publicity, while the poor Shastris, who help them in solving textual difficulties and supplying material from various original sources, have to remain in obscurity !

With due deference to the modern methods of critical and historical research and with due credit to the valuable dictionaries, indexes, catalogues of MSS , *principles of textual criticism deciphering of*

$ (a) They (the Shastris) have a depth of knowledge which a modern scholar does not possess They study one subject go deeply into it and can give substantial help to modern scholars —Dr R G Bhandarkar

(b) 'Any modern *Savant* will admit that but for the Pundit his own achievements would have been impossible —Dr Ganganath Jha

(c) ' From a purely scientific point of view it is desirable to preserve living specimens of the traditional system of learning as long as possible, as they are of distinct interest and can help us to understand many points which will become real puzzles, when once the tradition is lost —Dr. Stein

inscriptions, synthetic literary criticism, etc ,—the modern aids to research—it can be asserted that

(d) " How often have I heard Buhler speak most appreciatively of the Pandits who helped him in his Sanskrit researches ! He often said that it was quite impossible for a Western scholar to enter into the spirit of the Shastras, more especially the grammatical and the philosophical treatises, without the help of a Pandit "

—M Winternitz-Poona Sanskrit College Prospectus

(e) " Sanskrit literature, apart from the Vedas, may be roughly divided into the philosophic and scientific portion on the one side, and the poetical and dramatic on the other. A to the latter, I make bold to say, that in the understanding and appreciation of it native scholars can derive almost no help from European scholars As to the former class I challenge any European, who has not himself studied, say, the Vedanta-Bhashya, or the Siddhanta Muktavali, or even the Kaumudi under a native Shastri, either to teach it satisfactorily to native students, or even to stand an examination in it himself In truth, it is notorious that the 'Eminent Orientalists' themselves learnt the greater and more important portion of what they know of Sanskrit in our country and under our scholars Dr Buhler knew nothing of Dharma Shastra until he studied it with the late Vinayaka Shastri Divekar, and Dr. Kielhorn knew nothing of the Vyakarana Shastra until he learnt it under the late Anant Shastri Pendharkar But this I do say, that for a real appreciation of our Kalidasas and Bhavabhutis, and for a real understanding of our Nyaya and Vedanta and Vyakarana neither England nor Germany can suffice. You may learn the Rigveda in Europe and America and I think, indeed, that a European or American scholar has a considerable advantage over us in that department of learning But as regards our non-Vedic

they have led us to dilettantism rather than to real Sanskrit scholarship † In the first place, the intensive study of Sanskrit has been shelved and a sceptical attitude towards Sanskrit language and literature has been formed A mischievous tendency, therefore, that is rampant among many educated Indians is to pin their faith on what is Western and to take at a discount what is Oriental ! $ Some Westernized scholars, who pride themselves upon their modern methods, hold the Shastris, the

literature, we entirely deny the superiority claimed for, *not* by, our European brethren And I would add this too, that as regards our classical literature, the greatest purely European names must 'pale their ineffectual fires' before those of the scholars who have studied Sanskrit under our old Shastris " —Justice K T. Telang

† प्रत्यह विस्तारमुपगच्छत्सु शास्त्रार्थविषयेषु समुपजायमानतया शब्दार्थविशेषबाहुल्यस्य, मर्यादिततया च मानुषस्य मनसो धारणाशक्तेर्बुद्धेश्च विषयाकलनशक्तेर्यथा यथा वृद्धिं समुपयान्ति शास्त्रार्थविषयास्तथा तथा प्रगुणीभवति प्रयोजनमपि कोशादिग्रन्थानाम् । शास्त्रग्रन्थोपस्थितिं प्रति प्रतिदिनमधिकतर जायमानोनादरोपि बद्धादर कोशादिकपर्यालोचने कुरुते जनमित्यपि प्रत्यक्षीकुर्महे । —म. म. अभ्यङ्करोपाह्व–वासुदेवशास्त्रिण –

(न्यायकोशोपोद्घात)

$ " The belittling of the value of the traditional Shastric learning which was commenced by the classic tirade of Macaulay, and continued by the writings of more than one missionary, was soon taken up by a generation of ardent 'reformers' who, by practice and precept, did not a little to bring the traditional learning into disrepute'

Dr. S K. Belvalkar—
Poona Sanskrit College Prospectus

repositories of Oriental learning, in low estimation, and are indirectly helping the gradual degeneration of real Sanskrit scholarship and precious Shastric traditions. This tendency has nowadays been turned into the policy of rarely appointing Shastris for teaching Sanskrit in schools and colleges, and of depriving them of the Government and public support. It need not be supposed here that all Shastris at present are of the same high calibre as before. But how can the Shastris be expected to maintain a high calibre under disheartening circumstances? How can the degeneration of the Shastris be stopped, unless the attitude of wilful negligence be changed, and unless they are appointed to Government posts? A wide gulf of ill-feeling and distrust thus lies between the modern scholars and the public on the one hand and the Shastris on the other.

Those people, who know how for rejuvenating Shastric learning, proposals were made forty years ago for the establishment of a Government Sanskrit College at Poona and a branch of Oriental studies in the Bombay University, and who also remember how they went to airy nothing on the pretext of the inability of the Shastris to conduct original research [illegible] glish, will [illegible] Indians [illegible] A person with a probing eye can easily discern how many 'original' research scholars trained in Western methods have substantially contributed to Oriental learning and why the Shastris are incapacitated for

any kind of original work! While the Oriental faculties have already been instituted in other Universities and while Government Sanskrit Colleges *already exist in other provinces*, the apathy shown by people in the province of Bombay to Sanskrit studies is certainly not creditable. Why would Sanskrit be not called 'a dead language', when we thus willingly let it die?

Although the modern critical methods have been useful in the historical and philological research, they have proved insufficient for the intelligent and unbiassed grasp of the spirit of Hindu culture, to understand which the *analytico-synthetic or intensive methods* developed in ancient India are most useful § Again, all the results of the

§ "It is in the nature of things that we in the West must approach the problems connected with Indian civilization by means of modern Western methods And for *our purposes such methods are excellent as long as our aim* is to carry on an historical or comparative study But they often prove defective when we want to grasp the depth of Indian thought and Indian mentality The picture is often coloured by western notions To the historical scholar it is necessary to analyse, to systematise and to compare, and to create exact methods But every ancient civilization comprises a substratum which we cannot grasp by mere reasoning We must feel it and we must '*see*' it It seems to me that only the old fashioned Sastrin here really can help us we may be Indians or Europeans What we *really want is the Sastrin who is able to tell us how the* ancient leaders of Indian civilization thought and approached the problems

—Dr Sten Konow-Poona Sanskrit College Prospectus.

modern research work being published through the English medium are almost lost to the Sanskritists ignorant of English. In the matter of chronology, there has been, as it were, a tug of war between the Western and Hindu scholars, the former trying to establish that a particular Sanskrit author flourished after Christ, and the latter wasting their energy in refuting the arguments of the former, or bestowing a remote antiquity upon that author! When the proper perspective of the research scholars themselves is lost in this overwhelming mass of literature, people interested in the reading and enjoyment of Sanskrit literature and in the appreciation of the literary and cultural value of original Sanskrit works are bound to be bewildered.

Let it not be misunderstood that the Western methods of research are here being underestimated, and that the defects of the Shastris are being connived at. We are fully conscious of the conservative tendency of the Shastris. This tendency, though it prompts them to preserve our rich cultural heritage, stops them from maintaining progress, and from acquiring adaptability to changing times and the spirit of toleration. Moreover, even though they are equipped more or less with the critical and comparative outlook, on account of their study of logic and allied शास्त्र, yet it must be admitted that they have neither the historical sense in them nor interest in chronology. They are more interested in the minute analysis of literary problems than in their synthesis, though in philosophi-

cal matters they can establish a wider synthesis, and can exhibit a comparative outlook and comprehensive view of life. *Removing, therefore, these defects* and warding off the danger of the Western methods, as indicated above, they must accept the good contained in them, and learn to arrive at wider conclusions, as scientifically as the European scholars do, in the matter of the different branches of knowledge, such as, history, sociology, textual criticism, synthetic literary criticism, comparative philology, interpretations of the Vedas, etc., though they need not concern themselves much with questions of chronology for want of aptitude. When they can devote their lives to the mastery of abstruse शास्त्र, *it is certainly* not beyond their capacity to master and employ these *Western methods of extensive study in their own writings*. For this purpose it is highly essential that treatises putting together in a nutshell the principles of those methods should be written by Hindu scholars in Sanskrit as well as in the mother-tongue. Furthermore, concentrated and long-continued efforts of studying only व्याकरण (one of the six वेदाङ्ग) divert the Shastris from the main study of the Vedas; and their perspective is lost in mistaking the means for the end. Let it not be forgotten that *Pandits knowing the essentials of important* शास्त्र *and establishing their correlation are as much necessary as those well-versed in one* शास्त्र *only*. Let it still be remembered that the knowledge of the Western methods of extensive study will be of no avail without the intensive study of original Sanskrit

works. In short, *a happy combination of the intensive and extensive methods of study is a desideratum*; and Sanskrit scholars, who, with the profound study of ancient Sanskrit works and the intelligent use of the modern critical methods, are able to wield the weapon of the Sanskrit language, are overdue.

INDEX : A

INDEX : B

Index A & B printed by *B. N. Thakar* at Shri Siddheshwar Printing Press, Kolhapur.

वाङ्मयीन प्रकाशनें



१	जिवाचं मैतर (लघुकथा) प्रो. ना. सी. फडके		२॥ रु.
२	माझा धर्म (कादंबरी) ,, ,, ,,		३। रु.
३	उन्माद (द्वितीयावृत्ती) (कादंबरी) ,,		५ रु.
४	गुप्त प्रायश्चित (द्वितीयावृत्ती) (कादंबरी) ,,		५ रु.
५	समुद्रकांठीं (कादंबरी) बाळासाहेब शिंदे		१। रु.
६	कांचन (कादंबरी) माधव कामत		२। रु.
७	देवता कोण ? (लघुकथा) रा. शि. लिमये		१॥ रु.
८	कातणीचें घर (लघुनिबंध) राजकवि यशवंत		२ रु.
९	हिंदुस्थान व जग पं. जवाहरलाल नेहरू		२॥ रु.
१०	विद्यार्थी डॉ. रा. ना. अष्टपुत्रे		३ रु.
११	पुष्पांजलि (टीकालेख) प्रो. द. सी. पंगु		३॥ रु.
१२	माझा जीवनविहार गो. स. टेंबे (आत्मचरित्र)		१० रु.
१३	श्री सार्थ ज्ञानेश्वरी (प्रासादिक साखरे सांप्रदायिक शुद्ध प्रत.)		१५ रु.
१४	ज्ञानेश्वरी अध्याय १६ वा प्रो. द. सी. पंगु		३। रु.